

Hrozný and Hittite The First Hundred Years

*Proceedings of the International Conference Held at
Charles University, Prague, 11–14 November 2015*

Edited by

Ronald I. Kim
Jana Mynářová
Peter Pavúk



BRILL

LEIDEN | BOSTON

Contents

Abbreviations IX

Introduction 1

PART 1

Hrozný and His Discoveries

- 1 Hrozný's Excavations at Kültepe and the Resurrection of a Bronze Age Palace 5
Gojko Barjamovic
- 2 Hrozný's Excavations, 1924–1925: Sheikh Sa'ad, Tell Erfad 32
Jan Bouzek
- 3 Hrozný and the Decipherment of Hieroglyphic Luwian 44
J.D. Hawkins
- 4 Bedřich Hrozný and the Aegean Writing Systems: An Early Decipherment Attempt 62
Artemis Karna
- 5 A Fruitful Collaboration between E. Sellin and B. Hrozný during His Viennese Years: The Cuneiform Texts from Tell Taanach and Their Impact on Syro-Levantine Studies 78
Regine Pruzsinszky

PART 2

Hittite and Indo-European

- 6 Consonant Clusters, Defective Notation of Vowels and Syllable Structure in Caromemphite 95
Ignasi-Xavier Adiego
- 7 Tagging and Searching the Hittite Corpus 120
Dita Frantíková

- 8 The Phonetics and Phonology of the Hittite Dental Stops 147
Alwin Kloekhorst
- 9 Über die hethitische 3. Sg. Präsens auf *-ia-lz-zi* 176
Martin Joachim Kümmel
- 10 The Word for *Wine* in Anatolian, Greek, Armenian, Italic, Etruscan, Semitic and Its Indo-European Origin 195
Reiner Lipp
- 11 Satzanfänge im Hethitischen 230
Rosemarie Lühr
- 12 Hittite Historical Phonology after 100 Years (and after 20 Years) 258
H. Craig Melchert
- 13 ^{MUNUS/f}*duttarijata/i-* and Some Other Indo-European Maidens 277
Veronika Milanova
- 14 One Century of Heteroclitc Inflection 295
Georges-Jean Pinault
- 15 From Experiential Contact to Abstract Thought: Reflections on Some Hittite Outcomes of PIE **steh₂*- ‘to stand’ and **men-* ‘to think’ 317
Marianna Pozza
- 16 Hittite Syntax 100 Years Later: The Case of Hittite Indefinite Pronouns 335
Andrei V. Sideltsev
- 17 Das unerwartete <u> in der altassyrischen Nebenüberlieferung hethitischer Wörter 354
Zsolt Simon
- 18 The Personal Deictic Function of Hittite *kāša*, *kāšma* and *kāšat(t)a*: Further Evidence from the Texts 365
Charles W. Steitler

- 19 Lycian *Erimñnuha* 382
Jan Tavernier
- 20 The Indo-European Feminine, the Neuter, and the Diagnostic Value of
the τὰ ζῶα τρέχει rule in Greek and Anatolian 396
Annette Teffeteller
- 21 Sidetisch – Ein Update zu Schrift und Sprache 416
Christian Zinko and Michaela Zinko

PART 3

The Hittites and Their Neighbors

- 22 The LÚ.MEŠ SAG and Their Rise to Prominence 435
Tayfun Bilgin
- 23 Virginité in Hittite Ritual 455
Billie Jean Collins
- 24 Venus in Furs: Sappho fr. 101 Voigt between East and West 469
Alexander Dale
- 25 A Problem of Meaning: Variations in Hittite Landscape as Narrated in
the Sun-God's *mugawar* (CTH 323) 484
Romina Della Casa
- 26 „Fehler“ und Fehlschreibungen in hethitischen Texten 499
Susanne Görke
- 27 Personennamen der hethitischen Großreichszeit als Quellen religiöser
Verhältnisse 506
Manfred Hutter
- 28 Die Gottheit Nikarawa in Karkamiš 518
Sylvia Hutter-Braunsar
- 29 From Nerik to Emar 531
Patrick M. Michel

- 30 The Last Foothold of Arzawa: The Location of Puranda and Mount
Arinnanda Revisited 544
Rostislav Oreshko
- 31 Phrygia and the Near East 571
Maya Vassileva
- 32 The Disappearance of Telipinu in the Context of Indo-European
Myth 583
Roger D. Woodard
- 33 Foreign Medical Knowledge in Hattuša: The Transmission and
Reception of Mesopotamian Therapeutic Texts in the Hittite
World 603
Valeria Zubieta Lupo
- Word Index 619
- Index of Modern Names 649
- Index of Historical and Mythological Names 657
- Index of Text Passages 661
- Index of Place Names 669
- Subject Index 673

The Word for *Wine* in Anatolian, Greek, Armenian, Italic, Etruscan, Semitic and Its Indo-European Origin

Reiner Lipp

Abstract

It can be shown that Hittite *uijan(a)*- ‘grapevine; wine’ continues a Proto-Indo-European *nomen agentis* **uéh₁-on-*/ **u_hih₁-n’* ‘twiner, creeping plant, grapevine’, and that this stem formation provides the derivational base for further Indo-European words for ‘wine’ such as Latin *vīnum* < **u_hih₁-n-ó-* and Greek *οἶνος* < **uó_hin-o-* < **uó_hi(h₁)-n-o-*, with the corresponding affiliation adjective preserved in Armenian *gini* ‘wine’ < **gu_hin₁io* < **uo_hin-ih₂ó-*. The morphological structure of the respective base word and its derivatives corresponds to regular Proto-Indo-European patterns of word formation and is therefore congruous with the assumption of an Indo-European origin of the lexemes in question. Accordingly, it is likely that the etymologically isolated Semitic **u_hainu* ‘wine’ was borrowed from Mycenaean Greek and that Proto-Kartvelian **γ_huinio* ‘wine’ is a loanword from Proto-Armenian or its prestige.

Keywords

wine – Indo-European – Hittite – Greek – Latin – Etruscan – Semitic – etymology – internal derivation – hypostasis

Introduction

In the Neolithic period the wild grapevine was to be found in the northern Mediterranean, on the lower and middle Danube, on the north coast of the Black Sea (Pontus), in the area of the northern and southern Caucasus, on the south coast of the Caspian Sea, in the Zagros region and in Anatolia on its Black Sea and Mediterranean coasts. Since already in the Neolithic period the berries of the wild grapevine were used for fermentation to wine, the Proto-Indo-Europeans in their homeland north of the Black Sea and the Caucasus also probably knew how to produce wine from local wild vines. Therefore it is

legitimate to search for an explanation of the origin of the various designations for ‘wine’, which resemble each other in the individual Indo-European languages, on the basis of the phonology, morphology as well as the lexical and derivational patterns of Proto-Indo-European and the early stages of the relevant individual languages. For this purpose, the evidence from the Old Indo-European languages is presented in the following and supplemented by material from the adjacent languages.

The first evidence for the production of wine (with admixture of resin for better preservation) is provided by a residuum of tartaric acid in a ceramic vessel found at a neolithic site from 5400–5000 BC in the northern Zagros area (Hajji Firuz Tepe, Iran).

See MCGOVERN GLUSKER, EXNER and VOIGT 1996, MCGOVERN 2003: 64–74

On the various forms of the word for ‘wine’ and ‘grapevine’ in the Indo-European area and neighbouring regions, the prehistoric distribution of the wild grapevine (also in the North Pontus area of the original Indo-European homeland) as well as the beginning of wine-growing and its spread after the domestication of the grapevine, we are informed concisely by EIEC: 644–646 and in detail by the monographs of McGovern, Fleming and Katz 1996, McGovern 2003 with further references. A fundamental study on the origins and spread of wine, which ties together data from as many sources as possible (linguistics, archaeology, literature), has recently been provided by the as yet unpublished Ph.D. thesis of Luke Gorton (Gorton 2014) and an article based on it (Gorton 2017). Further references to historico-cultural, philological, and linguistic treatments are to be found in Aspesi 2013, Brogyanyi and Lipp 2016 and the comprehensive etymological lemma on the Hittite word for ‘wine; grapevine’ in HEG IV: 556–564.

1 The Anatolian Evidence

1.1

Hittite *uīān(a)*- c. ‘wine; grapevine’ (written mostly as the Sumerogram GEŠTIN ‘wine’ or ^{GIŠ}GEŠTIN beside its simplified variant GEŠTIN ‘grapevine’ with or without phonetic complements) is to be regarded as the continuant of the Proto-Anatolian form **uīān-* < Pre-Proto-Anatolian **uīh₁-on-* (**/h₁/* without vowel coloration, i.e. without oral constriction, therefore probably articulated as a glottal fricative [*h*] as in German *Haus*, English *house*).

According to Kloekhorst (2008: 1012), the Hittite form represents an original *n*-stem *uijan-* matching Hieroglyphic Luwian *uijan-i-*, *uin-i-* c. 'grapevine' and the base of the corresponding adjective Cuneiform Luwian *uin-ia-* (see below §1.2), which display apophony of the athematic stem (no vowel breaking, see below §7.3), and there is no clear evidence for a thematic *a*-stem in Anatolian. In fact, within the Hittite paradigm itself, practically all attested forms with phonetic complements or in phonetic spelling (except for the instr.sg. *ú-i-ia-an-ta* in fragmentary context, see below) are ambiguous as to their stem formation, as can be seen in the following sample (for the Hittite attestations in their context, see HEG IV: 557–558 with further references):

acc.sg. *ú-i-ia-na-an* = */uijanan/* 'wine' (KBo XII 126 + I 69 [MH/MS]) in purely phonetic spelling besides GEŠTIN-*na-an* 'wine' (KUB xxxvi 110 Rs. 7 [OS]; KBo xvii 11 + Rs. IV 23 [OS]; KUB lvi 50 II 2 [NH]), GEŠTIN-*an* 'wine' (KUB xxix 1 III 2 [OH/NS]; StBoT viii Rs. III 14 [OH]; Otten and Souček 1969: 30–31), gen.sg. GEŠTIN-*ia-na-aš* = *ui₅-ia-na-aš* 'of the wine' (in */uijanas 'spanduzijassar/* 'vessel for the libation of the wine' KUB lvi 50 II 5 [NH]; GEŠTIN = *ui₅-*), GEŠTIN-*aš* 'of the wine' (KBo xxiv 34 + Vs. 23 [MH]), abl.sg. GEŠTIN-*ia-na-az* = *ui₅-ia-na-az* 'with wine' (KBo xiv 103 Rs. IV 11; GEŠTIN = *ui₅-*), instr.sg. GEŠTIN-*ni-it* = */uijanid/* 'with wine' (KUB x 95 Vs. III 6 [NH]), GEŠTIN-*it* 'with wine' (VSNF12, 21 Vs. III 8 [NH]); in fragmentary context: instr.sg. GEŠTIN-*ta šu-un[-na-aḥ-ḥé* 'and with wine fill[ed] r' (KBo xvii 4 III 16' [OH]; cf. Otten and Souček 1969: 34–35, 129; *-ta* = */-t-a/* < **/-d-ha/* with enclitic *-a* 'and' < **-ha* = Pal., CLuw. *-ḥa* 'and, also' < **-h₂o* 'at that'); with clearly athematic stem formation, on the other hand, instr.sg. *ú-i-ia-an-ta* = */uijan-d/* (IBoT III 93 I 12), which for its fragmentary context is unclear in meaning however: 'with wine' or 'with grapevine'? (on instr.sg. GEŠTIN-*ta* and *ú-i-ia-an-ta* cf. Oettinger 2003: 143–144 n. 4; for further attestations of forms from the paradigm of the Hittite word for 'grapevine; wine', see below §§1.1.3–4).

The Sumerogram GEŠTIN = */uijan-/* was also used by acrophony as a syllabic sign with the value <*ui*>, which in the philological classification is represented as the syllabogram *ui₅-*, e.g. *pa-an-ga-u-ui₅* = *pa-an-ga-u-i* dat.-loc. of *panku-* 'assembly' and *na-a-ui₅* = *na-a-ú-i* 'not yet'.

Cf. SILVESTRI 1974: 266 with n. 1, RÜSTER and NEU 1989: 153–154 Nr. 131, HOFFNER and MELCHERT 2008: 21

For the shape of the instrumental ending, cf. athematic Hitt. *genu-* ntr. 'knee' (OHitt. + nom.acc. *gēnu*, gen. *gēnuu₅aš* ← PIE **gón-u/ *gén-u-* → **gn-éu-*) with instr. OHitt. *genut*, *ganut*; Hitt. *keššar-/kišr-/kiššer-* c. → ntr. 'hand' (< **g^hés-or-/obl.* **g^hes-r'* ← PIE loc. **g^hes-ér* from root noun

ǵʰós-*/ǵʰés-* ‘hand’ [Neri 2013: 195–196, 200]; nom. OHitt. *keššar* < **ǵʰés-ōr* and remodelled *kišširaš* etc., Gr. *χέιρ* f. < obl. **ǵʰes-r-*) with instr. OHitt. *kiššarat*, MHitt. *kiššarta* = */gisar-d/*, MHitt. *kiššarit*, *kišrit*; and Hitt. *išḫiman-/išḫimen-* c. ‘cord, rope’ (< **sh₂i-món-/obl. *sh₂i-mén- ← PIE *sh₂éi-mon-/obl. *sh₂i-mén-*; nom. OHitt. *išḫimāš* < **sh₂i-mó+s ← PIE *sh₂éi-mō(n)* vs. later remodelled nom. *išḫimanaš*; see below §§1.1.3, 7.4) with instr. OHitt. *išḫimanta* = */iḫiman-d/*, MHitt. *išḫimanit* as against thematic *šākuṽa* coll.pl. ‘eyes’ with instr. *šākuṽat*, *šakuit* and secondarily thematic *antuḫša-* ‘human being, man’ with instr. *antuḫšet*.

On the Hittite paradigm forms see HOFFNER and MELCHERT 2008: 13, 77, 79–80, 101, 111–112, 115–116; on the genesis of the athematic instrumental ending *-d/*, *-id/* see MELCHERT and OETTINGER 2009

1.1.1

H.C. Melchert (p.c.) assumes, however, that, corresponding to Luwian */uḫian-ī-/*, */uḫin-ī-/* ‘grapevine’ from athematic **uḫian-* with a further derivative */uḫin-ī-/* for the designation of ‘wine’ in Hier.Luw. (continuing the affiliation adjective *uḫin-ūa-* ‘pertaining to a grapevine’ as attested in Cun.Luw.; see below §1.2), in Hittite the athematic stem *uḫian-* was limited to the designation of the ‘grapevine’, which was rendered by the Sumerogram ^{GIS}GEŠTIN or simplified GEŠTIN ‘grapevine’, and that for the designation of ‘wine’, rendered by the Sumerogram GEŠTIN ‘wine’, Hittite used a descriptively thematic hypostasis *uḫian-a-**, which was based on the athematic stem and thus denoted **‘drink from the grapevine’*; this hypostasis would then underlie the attested inflectional forms for ‘wine’, which are ambiguous as to their stem formation like the aforementioned forms, e.g. gen.sg. GEŠTIN-*ia-na-aš* = *uḫi₅-ia-na-aš* ‘of wine’. According to Melchert’s analysis, a hypothetical nom.sg. Hitt. **/uḫian-a-s/* ‘wine’ would be a hypostasis of the gen. */uḫian-as/* ‘(that) of the grapevine’, which belongs to the athematic paradigm of */uḫian-/* ‘grapevine’ (for this analysis, see Gorton 2014 with n. 91, 2017: 7–8). This explanation would account for the formation in question, because the mechanism of forming a hypostasis from the genitive was productive in Hittite, cf. *uāštul* ntr. ‘sin’ with gen. *uāštulaš* ‘(the one) of the sin’ = ‘the sinner’, *tajazil* ntr. ‘theft’ with gen. *tajazilaš* ‘(the one) of the theft’ = ‘the thief’ (cf. Friedrich 1974: 123, Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 256, Puhvel 2012).

1.1.2

In fact, for finding out the underlying stem class of the word for ‘wine’ and ‘grapevine’ we have only the attestation of a clearly athematic instrumental form in fragmentary context, that is *ú-i-ia-an-ta* (see above §1.1). But as its

meaning is unclear from the context, it therefore does not tell us if the athematic stem *uijan-* also had the meaning 'wine' beside 'grapevine'.

For a descriptively thematic stem **uijan-a-* 'wine' as base of a derivational form, one could perhaps adduce the Anatolian toponym */uijana-ṽanta-/* (synchronically understandable as **uijana-ṽant-* 'abundant in wine'), which in the Hittite transmission appears as ^{URU}*ui₅-ia-na-ṽa-an-da* KBo IV 3 1 18 (in the contract between the Hittite king *Muršiliš* II and *Kupanta*-^dKAL, king of the Luwian states *Mira* and *Kuṽaliṽa*), ^{URU}*ui₅-ia-na-u-ṽa-an-ta* (Brandenstein 1943: 14, 53–54, Text 2 Vs. II 1 [Text 2 = VAT 6688 + Bo 2496]), ^{URU}*ui₅-ia-na-ṽa-an[-ta-aš]* KUB XXVI 43 1 15 (in the royal decree by Tudḫaliṽaš IV and Puduḫepa, beside the variant given below). In the classical epoch, this toponym has a correspondence in the name of the Lycian city of *Οἰνόανδα* (ntr.pl.) = *Oenianda* in the upper Xanthos valley (Strabo XIII 631; Ptolemy, *Geog.* v 3,6; Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* v 101) and *Oeniandos*, later called *Epiphania*, in southeast Cilicia (Pliny, *Nat. Hist.* v 93). As in the Greek version there is an adaption to the thematic noun *οἶνος* 'wine', one cannot decide on this evidence if the Anatolian base word had a final stem vowel or not. But the use of the syllabogram <-na-> instead of <-nu-> before <-ṽa-> or <(-u)-ṽa-> shows that there is a real *a*-vowel after the preceding /n/ and that therefore the following /u/ is intervocalic, a fact which can be expressed orthographically by the use of an additional vowel syllabogram, thus <-na-u-ṽa-> besides <-na-ṽa-> to render a sequence /-naṽa-/ (for this orthographic usage, cf. Kimball 1999: 105).

On the other hand, there are indeed Hittite versions of this toponym without a final *a*-vowel of the derivational base, i.e. */uijan-ṽanta-/* attested in *ui₅-ia-nu-an-ta-aš* KBo II 7 1 18, and */ṽin-ṽanta-/* = *ui₅-nu-ṽa-an-ta-aš* KUB XXVI 50 1 4 (in the royal decree by Tudḫaliṽaš IV and Puduḫepa, beside the variant given above), *ú-i-nu-an-da* KBo XVII 103 1 16, 17. These forms continue the possessive formations **uijan-ṽant-* and **ṽin-ṽant-* 'abundant in grapevine/ vine-stocks' based on athematic **uijan-/ *ṽin-* 'grapevine, vine-stock' as reflected by Luwian (Hieroglyphic Luwian *uijan-i-*, *ṽin-i-* c. 'grapevine, vine-stock', Cuneiform Luwian *ṽin-iṽa-* adj. 'pertaining to a grapevine'; see below §1.2). The variant */uijana-ṽanta-/* might thus be a remodelling of these primary forms under the influence of an existing thematic noun **uijan-a-* 'wine', whereas *Οἰνόανδα*, the epichoric form of classical times, might be a Greek adaption of */ṽin-ṽanta-/* (derived from athematic **ṽin-* 'grapevine') with *ṽ* being rendered by Gr. <o> in the absence of /ṽ/ in Greek. As for *Oeniandos*, this has been supposed to be based on Hitt.-Luw. *ṽiniṽant-* as a toponym with a different formation meaning originally **'wine, must, grape juice'* (cf. Neumann 1962: 208, 211; for the formation, see below §1.1.5), but it has to be considered that also *Οἰνόανδα* shows the variant *Oenianda* in Latin rendering with the vowel *-i-* perhaps as in

compounds. (For the analysis of the variants, see Silvestri 1974: 272–273, 274; for the attestations id. 269–271 [Cuneiform], 272–273 [classical] on the basis of Laroche 1961: 61; for the Cuneiform attestations, cf. del Monte and Tischler 1978: 482–483, HEG IV: 560 with further refs.; for the attestation and localization of the respective Anatolian toponyms in classical times, cf. Zgusta 1984: 431–432 with further refs.; and for the identification of Hieroglyphic Luwian (REGIO)VITIS ‘vine-stock country’ with the toponym */uḫḫan(a)uanta-/*, see Poetto 1993: 48–49, 80 with n. 193 and further refs., Hawkins 1995: 29, 54–55, 78.)

1.1.3

On the other hand, one also has to consider the possibility of the occurrence of a secondary thematic stem in *-a-*, which is neither conditioned by derivation nor hypostasis, but rather due to late paradigmatic remodelling of an athematic stem. For Old Hittite, one can expect a primary athematic nom.sg. **/uḫḫas/* or **/uḫḫās/* (< Pre-Proto-Anatolian **uḫ₁-ō+s* or **uḫ₁-ō+s* ← PIE nom.sg. **uḫ₁-ō(n)*) beside acc.sg. **uḫḫ₁-ón-* with accent shift according to the **k^wetuóres* rule, and obl. **uḫ₁-n-*; for the reconstruction of the stem formation and its apophony, see below §§6.1, 7.1, 7.4, 9.1). Within the inner history of Hittite, this form could have been replaced by a descriptively thematic nom.sg. **/uḫḫan-a-s/* backformed in analogy to acc.sg. GEŠTIN-*na-an* = */uḫḫan-an/* etc.; cf. the *n*-stem *išḫiman-* c. ‘cord, rope’ with nom.sg. OHitt. *išḫimāš* (< **sh₂i-mō+s* = OSax. *sīmo*, OE *sīma* ‘rope’ < Pre-Proto-Germanic **sih₂-mō* ← PIE **sh₂é₁-mō(n)*)/obl. **sh₂i-mén-*) and its younger remodelling into nom.sg. Hitt. *išḫimanaš* in analogy to acc.sg. *išḫimanan* (< **sh₂i-món-* ← PIE **sh₂e₁-món-* with accent shift by the **k^wetuóres* rule”, see below §7.4; for the paradigm, cf. Harðarson 1987: 122, Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 111). And there is indeed an Old Hittite form GEŠTIN-*aš* in the meaning ‘grapevine, vine-stock’, which can either be interpreted as nom.sg. **/uḫḫas/* or **/uḫḫās/* (from athematic */uḫḫan-/*) or **/uḫḫan-a-s/* (backformation from the athematic acc.sg. */uḫḫan-an/* etc.) or as gen.sg. **/uḫḫan-as/* (from athematic */uḫḫan-/*): *n=ašta anda ḫalkiaš* ^dGÌR-*aš* G[ÉŠ]TIN-*aš kitta* ‘and in it (i.e. in the fleece) lies/is put the field god of the grain and (of) the vine-stock’ (KUB XVII 10 IV 30 [OH/MS]; cf. HEG IV: 557–558).

Thus, even if a Hitt. nom.sg. of the form **/uḫḫan-a-s/* in the meaning ‘wine’ were unambiguously attested, we still could not tell if this formation is merely a secondary inner-Hittite remodelling within the paradigm of an athematic stem *uḫḫan-* ‘wine ← grapevine’ showing a metonymic semantic shift (cf. Akkad. *karānu* ‘grape, grapevine; wine’; see below §11), or if it continues a Pre-Hittite hypostasis **uḫḫan-a-s* ‘wine’ = ‘drink from the grapevine’, which arose by reanalysis of the athematic gen.sg. */uḫḫan-as/* ‘(that) of the grapevine’ (see above

§1.1.1). In this case, we are therefore confronted with a heuristic dilemma and can only say that in Hittite the existence of a distinct hypostasized *a*-stem **uijan-a*- meaning ‘wine’ beside an *n*-stem *uijan*- meaning ‘grapevine’ is possible and inferable with some plausibility, but not provable [so also L. Gorton *per litteras*].

1.1.4

Nom.sg. Hitt. GEŠTIN-*iš* = /*uijan-i-s*/ ‘grapevine, vine-stock’ appears as expression of a generic singular in the following passage of a New Hittite version of an Old Hittite text (KBo VI 26 I 18–19; HEG IV: 558): *takku* GEŠTIN-*iš* ^{GIS}ḪAŠḪUR [^{GIS}ḪAŠḪUR.KUR.RA *našma* ^{GIS}Š]ENNUR *urāni* ‘if the grapevine/vine-stock, the apple tree, the apricot tree or medlar tree burns down’. Due to the fact that the Sumerograms in this passage do not show plural markers and the verb is in the singular (*urāni* ‘burns down’), it is likely that in the series of plants mentioned each is enumerated in the generic singular; therefore it is less likely that GEŠTIN-*iš* is a form of the nom.pl. with the late New Hittite ending -*iš* (for this ending, cf. Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 71 with refs.). This *i*-stem formation meaning ‘grapevine, vine-stock’ is probably a late Hittite borrowing or remodelling on the basis of Luwian /*uijan-ī-s*/ ‘grapevine, vine-stock’, as attested by Hieroglyphic Luwian (‘VITIS’) *wa/i-ia-ni-sa*, with normal Luw. *ī*-mutation in the *genus commune* (see below §1.2).

A clearly hybrid Hitt. *i*-stem formation like Hitt. GEŠTIN-*iš*, which was triggered by the productive Luw. *ī*-mutation of Luwians speaking Hittite, can also be seen in another NHitt. version of an OHitt. text, that is nom. sg. *antuḫahḫiś* ‘human being’ as a remodelling of a clearly archaic form *antuḫahḫaś* stemming from the OHitt. original (< nom.sg. PIE **en-dʰuéh₂-ōs* from *s*-stem **en-dʰuéh₂-os* / **en-dʰuh₂-s*- ‘having breath in oneself’). Already in the spoken language of the Middle Hittite epoch, this archaic form was replaced with *antuḫšaś* by generalization of *antuḫša*- based on the oblique stem as in OHitt. gen.sg. *anduḫšaś* (< **en-dʰuh₂-s-ós*).

See RIEKEN 1999: 191–192 with n. 884, KIMBALL 1999: 184, HOFFNER and MELCHERT 2008: 79–80 with n. 1

1.1.5

Luwian origin also has to be considered for the derivative Hitt. ^(d)*uiniḫant*- ‘(the genius of the) grape juice, must’ < **uiniḫ-ant*- ‘consisting of grape juice’ with acc.sg. ^d*ú-i-ni-ia-an-ta-an* (KUB LV 65 IV 16), *ú-i-ni-ia-an-da-an* (KUB xxv 37 III 17. 19 [NH]; KUB xxv 37 IV 6 [NH]) = /*uiniḫant-an*/ because of the formation of the base word corresponding to Hieroglyphic Luwian /*uini-*/ < **uin-ī-ja*- ‘wine,

must, grape juice' = 'drink made from grapevine', derived from *uijan(-i)-*, *uin(-i)-* 'grapevine' (cf. Starke 1990: 381 n. 1378, Oettinger 2003: 143 with refs., HEG IV: 563–564 with text attestations; see below §1.2).

1.2

Hieroglyphic Luwian *uijan-i-*, *uin-i-* c. 'grapevine, vine-stock' < Proto-Anatolian **uijon-/loc.* **uijén(-i)* (*é* > Luw. *a*)/obl. **uĩn-* < Pre-Proto-Anatolian **uih₁-on-/loc.* **uih₁-én(-i)*/obl. **uih₁-n-*: e.g. nom.sg. ('VITIS')*wa/i-ia-ni-sa* = *|uijan-ĩ-s/* (SULTANHAN §7), *wa/i-ia-ni-sá* (SULTANHAN §15), *wa/i-ia-ni-sa* (SULTANHAN §23); acc.sg. (VITIS)*wa/i-ni-na* = *|uĩn-ĩ-n/* (KÖRKÜN §11), ?dat.-loc.sg. *wa/i-ia-ni-[x]-i* = *|uijan-i/?* (KULULU 1 §8). In the nominative and accusative, this original *n*-stem shows the Luwian enhancement of the stem by */-ĩ-/*, which is regular in the *genus commune* and is called *ĩ*-mutation. Due to the effect of the widespread, but not pervasive Luwian contraction *ija* > *i* (= */-ĩ-/* presumably), which becomes more frequent in the 1st millennium BC (cf. Yakubovich 2015: 10 §5.2.1), some instances of Luw. *uĩn-* as in the acc. *|uĩn-ĩ-n/* might go back to the original strong stem *uijan-* as inferable for the acc. **|uijan-ĩ-n/* besides the attested nom. *|uijan-ĩ-s/*, but in other cases Luw. *uĩn-* can continue the weak stem variant **uĩn-* < Pre-Proto-Anatolian **uih₁-n-*. A derivative of this *n*-stem is attested in the form of the instr.sg. Hier.Luw. *wa/i-nĩ-ti* 'with (measures of) wine' (KARKAMIŠ A30h §3; for the semantic interpretation see Hawkins 2000: 178, 468) = *|uinĩdi/* < **uinĩjadi* with the Luwian contraction *ija* > *i*. Thus in the case of this Hieroglyphic Luwian form, we are dealing with a stem *|uinĩ-/* < **uin-ija-* (< **uĩn-ijō-*; for the respective contraction also in Luw. *-ija*-stems, cf. Yakubovich 2015: 13 §6.2) meaning 'wine, must, grape juice' = 'drink made from grapevine' as a designation of affiliation derived from *uijan(-i)-*, *uin(-i)-* 'grapevine' (for this morphological and functional analysis based on a suggestion by C. Melchert, see Gorton 2014 with nn. 89, 90; 2017: 6f.; see above §1.1.1), like Cuneiform Luwian *uin-ija-* adj. 'pertaining to a grapevine': coll.pl. *ú-i-ni-ia* = *|uinija/* (KBo XIII 263,2; quantity of *-ĩ-* in *|uĩn-/* depending on the position of the Anatolian accent). (For the attestations, cf. Starke 1990: 381 n. 1378, Melchert 1993: 269, Kloekhorst 2008: 1012, ACLT s.v. Hieroglyphic *wiyani(ya)-*, HEG IV: 558–559.)

1.2.1

The usual designation for 'wine' in Luwian has a different etymological origin: CLuw. *ma-ad-du* = *|máddu/*, HLuw. (VITIS)*ma-tú-sà*, *ma-tu-sà* = *|máddu-sa/* ntr. 'wine' (Luwian gemination by fortition of a lenis after inherited **é* in open syllable by Lex Čop) < Proto-Anatolian **médu* 'sweet grape-juice' < PIE **médh₁-u-* 'honey, mead' = Ved. *mádh₁-* 'sweet drink, honey', Gr. *μέθυ* 'intoxicating

drink, wine', OHG *metu* 'mead', OCS *medъ* 'honey' etc. (cf. Starke 1990: 191 n. 624, HEG II: 165–166, Melchert 1993: 144–145, ACLT s.v. Hieroglyphic *mattu-*, s.v. Cuneiform *mattu-*).

2 The Greek Evidence

Greek οἶνος m. 'wine' (Hom.*Il.*+), gen.sg. Cret. φοῖνο (Gortyn), Cypr. *wo-i-no* = /*woĩnō*/, and already Mycenaean *wo-no* = /*woĩnos*/, Myc. ox name *wo-no-qo-so* = /*woinok^w-orsos*/ *'having wine-coloured buttocks' (for the Mycenaean evidence, see DMic. II 442–445; cf. Hom. οἶνοπ- 'wine-coloured, dark red' < **woĩn-ok^w*- 'wine-coloured, having the appearance of wine') < Proto-Gr. **woĩno-* < PIE **woĩ(h₁)-no-* 'wine' (on the formation, see below §§10.2.1–2), from which the collective Gk. οἴνη f. 'grapevine, vine-stock' (Hesiod+) < **woĩnā* (in the functional meaning *'wine plant') is derived (cf. ἐλαίᾱ, Ion. -η 'olive-tree, olive' : ἔλαιον 'olive oil'). Beside these forms, there were semantically corresponding continuants of **médh^h-u-* 'honey, mead' in Myc. *me-tu-wo ne-wo* gen. 'in the season of the new wine', Gr. Hom.*Il.*+ μέθυ 'intoxicating drink, wine', which in everyday language soon fell out of use and survived only as an archaic word in later poetry (for the Myc. evidence, see DMic. I 446; for the lexeme, see above §1.2.1 and below §5.6.2).

Context-sensitive laryngeal loss by Saussure's Law: *oRH.C* > *oR.C*. Cf. **tórh₁-mo-* 'hole' > **tór-mo-* > Gr. τóρμος 'hole' against **térh₁-tro-* > Gr. τέρετρον 'driller'; **sólh₂-uo-* 'whole, entire, undamaged' > **sól-uo-* > Gr. ὅλος, Ved. *sárva-* against **s_lh₂-eu-ó-* > Proto-Italic **sala^uo-* > Lat. *salvus*, Osc. *σαλαφσ*, **s_lh₂-i-* 'prosperity' > CLuw. *šalhi-tti-* (for further specification of Saussure's law, see below §3).

As etymologically related formations, note also the *n*-stem Gr. νίην, ἡ νίόν· τήν ἄμπελον (Hesychius) = **fiñ* 'grapevine, vine-stock' < Proto-Gr. **uijēn* < PIE **uih₁-én* (on the formation, see below §8), and the *u*-stem Myc. *we-je-we* = /*uei-eu-es*/ nom. pl. f. '(vine) shoots, sprouts' (DMic. II 418) from **uei_h-u-* / **uih₁-éu-* > **ueiu-* / **uiéu-* (for the analysis as feminine *u*-stem with apophonically conditioned suffix allomorph *-éu- and not as masculine *eu*-stem, cf. Perpillou 2012: 111) beside **uei_h-tu-* / **ui-téu-* '(willow) rod' (with secondary root apophony) > Hom.+ ἵτυς [i] 'rim of a wheel/shield' (Aeolic **fi₁tyς*, acc. to Terentianus Maurus 658: *vitum gens Aeoli*; cf. Lat. *vītis* 'tendril, grapevine'), and derived Hom.+ ἰτέη [i], Att. ἰτέα [i] 'willow; wicker shield' (γῑτέα [= **fi₁τέα*]. ἰτέα Hesychius), Εἰτέα Attic deme name (for the reshaped apophony, cf. Neri 2017: 324–325; see below §6.1).

3 The Armenian Evidence

Armenian *gini* ‘wine’ (gen. *ginwoy* = [*ginuο*] with *-uο* < **-iόio* < **-iόhio* undergoing pretonic syncope of unaccented **i* due to the prehistoric penultima accent) < (Pre-)Proto-Armenian **guīnīio* < **uēniion* < **uoin-iionm* ntr. < **uoin-ih₂ó-* as adjective of affiliation on the basis of the PIE noun **uó(i)(h₁)-n-o-* > **uóin-o-*, which is continued by Gr. (f)οῖνος ‘wine’ (on the development and paradigm of Arm. *gini*, cf. Schmitt 1981: 43, 52, 68, 69, 71, 95, Matzinger 2005: 20, 66–67 with n. 304, and Olsen 1999: 439–440, who explains the Arm. vacillation between *wo-* and *ea-* stem on the basis of an old neuter). For derivational reasons, the Arm. form is less likely developed from (**uēniio* <) **uein-iio* ← PIE **uei(h₁)-no-*. (For further references, cf. Martirosyan 2010: 214–215; on alternative derivations, see below §10.2.2.)

Context-sensitive laryngeal loss by Saussure’s Law: *oRH.C* > *oR.C* or *HRo* > *Ro* with tautosyllabic reduction according to Neri (2003: 32 n. 69). Cf. **h₂uors-ó-/éh₂-* ‘drop; dribble, rain’ > PIE **uors-ó-* resp. **uors-éh₂-* > Hitt. *uarša-* ‘fog, rain’, Luw. *uarša-* ‘drop’, causative **h₂uors-éie/o-* ‘to drop, let rain’ > PIE **uors-éie/o-* > Gr. οὐρέω ‘urinate’ vs. PIE **h₂uér-s-h₂/-éh₂-* ‘drop’ > Gr. **auers-a-/ā-* > Ion.Att. ἔρση, Hom. also ἐέρση, Sappho ἐέρσα, Pi. ἐερσα, Papyrus ἀέρση, Cret. ἀερσα (Hsch.) ‘dew(drop)’. For laryngeal loss also in a sequence with post-resonantic thematic vowel *-o-* per Neri (2003: 285 n. 949; 302 n. 1025), cf. **peth₁-* ‘to fall’ in Gr.Hom. πεπτεώς ‘ducked, crouching’ < perf.ptc. **pé-pth₁-uos-* vs. the verbal noun **póth₁-mo-* ‘fall(ing)’ = **pót.h₁mo-* > PIE **pót.mo-* > Gr. πότης ‘lot, destiny’.

Cf. LIPP 2009b: 417 n. 141; 454, 456, 446 n. 222 and 340–341 n. 66 with further refs. to Saussure’s Law

The sound shape of (Pre-)Proto-Armenian **guīnīio* (gen. **guīnīióio*) is to be presupposed for the borrowing into Proto-Kartvelian (= South Caucasian) with **guinīo* ‘wine’ > Georgian *gvino*, Old Georgian nom. *γwnoy*, *γwinoy* = [*guino-i*], Mingrelian *gvini* (with different adaptations of final **-io* [Sergio Neri, p.c.]). (For alternative interpretations and specifications, cf. Gippert 1994: 117–121; on the origin of vine cultivation in the sub-Caucasian area of Georgia and the Urartean-Armenian highland, cf. Greppin 2008.)

4 The Albanian Evidence

Albanian Tosk. *vérë*, Geg. *vënë* ‘wine’ < **ven-* < Proto-Albanian **uoinā* ← PIE **uó(i)(h₁)-n-o-* (see Demiraj 1997: 414).

5 The Italic Evidence

5.1

Latin *vīnum* ntr. ‘wine’ (since Livius Andronicus, Ennius, Plautus, Cato), Faliscan acc.sg. *UI[NO]M* [?] = /*vīnom*/ (ca. 600 BC; but interpretation doubtful, see below §5.2), *UINO* = /*vīno^m*/ (4th c. BC), Umbrian acc.sg. *VINU* = /*vīno^m*/, abl.sg. *VINU* = /*vīnu*/ (TI 3rd c. BC), *uinu* (TI 2nd c. BC) ‘wine’, Volscian abl.sg. *uinu* (ca. 300 BC) ‘wine’.

5.1.1

Attestations from the neighbouring non-Italic languages of Ancient Italy: Etruscan *VINUN* (Tarquinia, end of 6th c. BC), *VINU[M:]* (Populonia, second half of 5th c. BC), *VINUM* (Liber Linteus and Ager Saenensis, 2nd c. BC) ‘wine’ (ET I p. 107; II pp. 1–8, 67, 136, 167; Agostiniani 1998: 1–2; for the question whether Italic **vīnom* was borrowed into Etruscan or vice versa, see below §§5.6, 5.6.1–2); (Celtic) Lepontic *VINOM* (Ornavasso, 2nd c. BC; interpretation uncertain: ‘wine’ according to Lejeune 1987: 502–509, followed by Solinas 1995: 375, Uhlich 2007: 407, or ‘white, shining’ < **vīndo-* = Gaulish *vindo-* according to Tibiletti Bruno 1981: 163–164, cf. Agostiniani 1998: 2 n. 10; if Lep. *VINOM* means ‘wine’, then it might be borrowed from Etruscan or an Italic language).

5.2

First attestations in Italic: Faliscan LF 1 = LDIA: 525–526 (ca. 600 BC): *UI[NO]M:P[ORE]KADEUIOS* ‘vinum porrigat Euius (= Bacchus)’ (‘Euius shall procure the wine’), LF 5 = LDIA: 529–530 (4th c. BC) I: *FOIED.UINO.PIPAFO. CRA.CAREFO* II: *FOIED.UINO.PAFO.CRA.CAREFO* ‘hodie vinum bibam, cras carebo’ (‘today I will drink wine, tomorrow I will be without’). According to the new edition of the Faliscan inscriptions by Bakkum, the traditional restitution of the reading *UI[NO]M* in LF 1 = EF 1 is doubtful (Bakkum 2009: 199, 393–406); assured is thus only *UINO* in LF 5 = MF 59, 60 (Bakkum 2009: 199, 434–435).

First attestations in Etruscan (ET II pp. 67, 136): Ta o.6 (vas, end of 6th c. BC) *VINUN* ‘vinum’; Po 4.3 (cippus, second half of 5th c. BC) *FASLE.VINU[M:]M[...]* AŚ ‘vas / libatio vinum...’.

5.3

Probable cognates of Lat. *vīnum*, Umbr. *VINU* etc. are to be found in the personal names Pre-Samnite Ps 3 nom. *VINUXS* = /*vīnōxs*/, patronymic dat. *VINI-CIU* = /*vīnikijō*/ (Campania, 500–450 BC; the Pre-Samnite inscriptions from Campania, Lucania and Bruttium convey a dialect form close to that of South Picene and date back to the period before the invasion of the area by the Samnites beginning in 440 BC; see ST pp. 5–6), Oscan Po 3 gentile name nom.

VIÍNIKIÍŚ = [*ũnikĩęs*] with dissimilation from **-iis* < **-iĩs* < **-iĩ-o-s* as derivative of the patronymic (cf. Meiser 1986: 62–66), adapted as Lat. *Vīnucius*, *Vīnicius*, Etr. gen. *Vinucenas* (for the Sabellic attestations cf. ST pp. 71, 104; for the corresponding forms in Latin and Etruscan cf. Schulze 1966: 110 n. 3; 380) and also perhaps as Faliscan *uĩnu[cio]* (Bakkum 2009: 276, 556). These forms can be analysed as continuants or derivatives in **-iĩ-ó-* (< **-ih₂-ó-*) of the compound **ũn-ok^u-*, nom.sg. **ũn-ōk^u-s* ‘wine-coloured, having the appearance of wine’ (cf. Goth. *wein-nas* m. *a*-stem ‘having a nose (red) of wine’; Casaretto 2004: 58), thus **ũnok-iĩ-o-* > Pre-Samnite *VINICIIU* with delabialisation by analogy to *VINUXS* = [*ũnōxs*] < **ũnōks*. For the apophony of the second compound member, cf. etymologically related Gr. *οἰνώψ* Soph., *οἰνόπ-* Hom. ‘wine-colored, dark red’ < **uoin-ōk^u-s*, **uoin-ok^u-*, also used as personal name in Hom.*Od.* 21,144 *Οἰνοπος υἱός* ‘son of Oinops’ (see above §2; formation like Lat. *atrōx*, *-ōcis* ‘terrible in appearance, dreadful’, but without generalisation of the lengthened grade in Pre-Samnite, pace Meiser 1986: 172 n. 3). The stem displays the usual analogical lengthened grade in the nom.sg. of PIE monosyllabic root nouns and shows the effect of the preconsonantal Italic delabialisation of **k^u* as in the development of nom.sg. PIE **uōk^u-s* ‘voice’ (Ved. *vāk*, Av. *vāxš* vs. Gr. acc. *ῥπ-α*) > Italic **uōks* > Lat. *vōx*, which led to an analogical delabialization in the derived denominative **uok^u-ā-je/o-* ‘to call’ > Italic **uok^uāe/o-* → **uokāe/o-* > Lat. *vocō*, *-āre*, Umbr. *subocau* ‘invoco’ (for the delabialisation in Sabellic, cf. Buck 1928: 95). In contrast to the Etruscan gentile name *Vinacna* (Tarquinii, 6th c. BC), which is derived from the Sabellic stem in the shape **ũnok-*, the Pre-Samnite form *VINICIIU* < **ũnok-iĩ-o-* with medial *-i-* beside *VINUXS* < **ũnōk-s* either shows the effect of a vowel weakening in medial syllables or might have developed a context-sensitive anaptyctic vowel *-i-* after the beginning of Sabellic vowel syncope in open medial syllables like the later Oscan form *VIÍNIKIÍŚ*, but the variants with medial *-u-* such as Lat. *Vīnucius*, Falisc. *uĩnu[cio]*, Etr. *Vinucenas* rather speak in favour of the first solution, i.e. for vowel weakening (for cases of vowel weakening in Sabellic instead of syncope, cf. Buck 1928: 55–57, Meiser 1986: 203, 267–272, Lipp 2009b: 131–132; for vowel anaptyxis in Oscan, cf. Buck 1928: 50–53).

On the other hand, there has been the attempt by Kölligan (2013: 120–121) to derive the aforementioned Sabellic names from a compound form **ũ-nok^u-o-* ‘who harms/kills by force’, connecting it with Lat. *vīs* f., abl. *vī* ‘force’ and Lat. *noxa* ‘crime, damage’, *nex* ‘death’ on the base of an alleged root **nek^u-* ‘to disappear; perish’. But in view of the etymologically corresponding forms Lat. *noceō*, *-ēre* ‘to harm’ = Ved. *nāśáyati* ‘makes disappear, destroys’ etc., one has to posit the PIE root as **nek^u-* ‘to disappear, get lost’ (e.g. Ved. subj.aor. *naśanti* ‘will get lost’; LIV²: 451–452), which would entail an Italic compound form

* $\mu\bar{n}$ -*nok-o*- ‘having/provoking disappearance/harm by force’, without there being however other verbal governing compounds in *-*nok-o*- (as against the attested formations Lat. *nocuus* ‘harmful’, *innocuus* ‘harmless, innocent’, *noxius* ‘harmful’) or fixed parallel phrasal collocations with Lat. *vī* ‘by force’.

5.4

The forms of the word for ‘wine’ in the individual Italic languages can only go back to Proto-Italic * $\mu\bar{n}$ om, which would plausibly continue a morphologically regular IE ablaut form * $\mu\bar{ih}_1$ -*n-o*- (with zero grade of the root as Hitt. *uīian*- ‘wine; grapevine’, HLuv. *uīiani*-, *uīini*- ‘grapevine’ < * $\mu\bar{ih}_1$ -*on*-/* $\mu\bar{ih}_1$ -*n*- against *o*-grade in Gr. (f)οἶνος < * $\mu\bar{o}i$ (*h*)-*n-o*-).

On the other hand, the following derivation is to be rejected and only presented *argumenti causa*: it starts from a presumed Italic * $\mu\bar{o}i$ nom as continuant of PIE * $\mu\bar{o}i$ (*h*)-*n-o*- or borrowing of Gr. *uoinon**, acc.sg. of (f)οἶνος m. (such a borrowing has been assumed by Szemerényi 1989: 166, Sihler 1995: 53): Italic * $\mu\bar{o}i$ nom > early Lat. **ueinom* (4th–3rd c. BC) > **uēinom* (3rd c. BC) > *vīnum* (ca. 200 BC; * $\mu\bar{o}i$ - > **uei*- > **uē*- as in PIE * $\mu\bar{o}i$ k-o- ‘settlement’ [= Gr. (f)οἶκος ‘house’] > Italic * $\mu\bar{o}i$ ko- > early Lat. **ueiko*- > OLat. /*uēko*-/ in inscr. *vecos*, *veicus* > Lat. *vīcus* ‘village’). Contrary to the actual evidence of the very early attested forms Falisc. /*vīno*^m/ (4th c. BC), Umbr. /*vīno*^m/ (3rd c. BC+), which cannot be borrowed from Latin, one would then expect as correspondences in Faliscan * $\mu\bar{o}i$ nom > **uōnom* (cf. Falisc. *LOIFIRTA* > *LOFERTA* = Lat. *liberta*), in Oscan * $\mu\bar{o}i$ nom, and in Umbrian **uōnom* (cf. **moīni*- [= Goth. *ga-mains* ‘common’] > Lat. *com-mūnis*, Osc. nom.sg.f. *MŪÍNÍKŪ* /*moīneko*/ ‘common’, Umbr. *MUNEK-LU* /*mōneklom*/ ‘collection, offering’ < **moīni*-*tlo*-, *nomen instrumenti* from the denominal verb **moīni-je/o*- ‘to make common’).

5.5

The Faliscan and Umbrian forms are therefore incompatible with a phonological derivation from older * $\mu\bar{o}i$ nom (with Falisc. * $\mu\bar{o}i$ nom, Falisc. Umbr. **uōnom* as expected phonetic outcomes instead of actually attested Falisc. /*vīno*^m/, Umbr. /*vīno*^m/). In case of a development from Italic * $\mu\bar{o}i$ nom, the Latin sound shape *vīnum* would have developed too late (ca. 200 BC) and thus cannot be the source for an early borrowing into Faliscan (*UI[NO]M* [?], ca. 600 BC, *UINO* 4th c. BC), Etruscan (*VINUN*, end of 6th c. BC) and Umbrian (*VINU*, 3rd c. BC with text tradition from 5th–4th c. BC). The Latin form *vīnum* phonetically matching Faliscan /*vīno*^m/, Umbrian /*vīno*^m/ hence cannot continue an inherited form * $\mu\bar{o}i$ nom or a loan form * $\mu\bar{o}i$ nom from Greek acc.sg. /*uoinon*/*, which thus also cannot be the source of the other Italic forms. Therefore, the individual Italic forms presuppose * $\mu\bar{n}$ om as common base form (see Blümel

1972: 26, Beekes 1987: 22–23, Flobert 1994: 290–291, who exclude a representation of former **oi* or **ei* in the respective Italic forms; likewise Gorton 2017: 12–13).

5.6

On the other hand, Agostiniani (1998: 5–6; similarly Gérard 2009: 19–20, 21) considers Etruscan *VINUN*, *VINUM* as a loan from Greek, being based on the acc. Gr. *uoinon** and displaying an Etruscan sound substitution */ui-/* < **/ui-/* ← Gr. */uoi-/* similar to the process in the Etruscan name *VILATAS* ← Gr. *Oιλιάδα* with resyllabification of initial */ui-/* = <vi-> < **/ui-/* ← Gr. */oi-/*. However, in view of the incomplete match in the phonetic pattern of the compared forms, de Simone (2011: 476 with n. 17) is sceptical about Agostiniani's loanword hypothesis, which he also rejects for palaeobotanical and chronological reasons.

The Etruscan initial realization */ui-/* = <vi-> < **/ui-/* ← Gr. */oi-/* is orthographically and phonologically distinct from the medial representation */ui/* = <ui> ← Gr. */oi/* as in Etr. *TRUIA* ← Gr. *Τρούα*, Etr. *ΦUINIS* ← Gr. *Φοῖνιξ*; the diphthong */ui/* also appears in genuine Etruscan words like *PAPUI*, loc. in *-i* of the month name.

In contrast to Etruscan *VINUM* with normal Etruscan substitution of the final nasal by *-m* as in *PRUXUM* ← Gr. acc. *πρόχουν* from *πρόχους* 'jug', Etruscan *VINUN* shows a rare final *-n* as in the vessel designation *QUTUN* (already attested in the 7th c. BC) beside the synchronically more frequent variant *QUTUM* ← Gr. *κώθων*.

Cf. AGOSTINIANI 1998: 1–2

According to Agostiniani (1998: 6–7, 12–13 with n. 76), the Etruscan form *VINUM* spread together with the development of viniculture all over Italy from the end of the 8th century BC. In Agostiniani's view, the Etruscan lexeme *VINUM* = */uinum/* was adapted within the individual Italic languages in the shape **/uīnom/*, the long vowel */ī/* being due to analogy of the semantically related Italic **uītis* > Lat. *vītis* 'grapevine'. But within such a scenario, one could also suppose that with regard to duration in accented position or to the degree of opening, the vowel phoneme */i/* of Etruscan (which lacked a phonological opposition of vowel quantity) had a closer phonetic resemblance to the Italic long vowel */ī/* than to the Italic short vowel */i/*, which in contrast had a rather open articulation; cf. Lat. *Catamītus* ← Etruscan *Catmite* ← Gr. *Γανυμήδης*. Thus in Agostiniani's view, Latin *vīnum*, Faliscan */vīno^m/*, Umbrian */vīno^m/* < **uīnom* do not continue an inherited Italic form, but are loans from Etruscan *VINUM*, which for its part must be borrowed from Greek.

5.6.1

Against this scenario, one might object that **uīno-* is already attested from 500 BC (i.e. within the oldest text layer) as a compound member in ancient Italic names like Pre-Samnite *VINUXS* (< **uīn-ōk^(u)-s* ‘wine-coloured, having the appearance of wine’) and its derivative Pre-Samnite *VINICIU*, Osc. *VIĪNIĪS* (< **uīn-ok^(u)-iō-*) → Lat. *Vīnicius* etc. (see above §5.3). This means that in the Italic area the use of **uīno-* as an appellative for ‘wine’ must be older by several centuries.

In favour of the borrowing of the word for ‘wine’ from Italic into Etruscan, and not vice versa, one can also point to *FUFLUNS*, the Etruscan name of the wine god Bacchus, which was probably borrowed from Italic, as, contrary to unaccented word-internal vowels, in this form the vowel of the second syllable is never syncopated, therefore probably reflecting a long vowel of Sabellic origin (because of the phonetic length of accented vowels in native Etruscan words, the last word-internal long vowel of a form borrowed from a foreign language was evidently interpreted by Etruscan speakers as being accented and therefore did not undergo syncope, cf. Rix 2008: 147). The following derivations have been proposed: Etruscan *FUFLUNS* ← (dissimilation) **fluflūns* ← Italic **flōβlōno-* < **b^hlōd^hlōno-* < transposite **b^hleh₃-d^hlo-h₃no-* ‘master of the garden’ from **b^hlēh₃-d^hlo-* ‘place of blossom, garden’ related to Lat. *flōs* m. ‘blossom’ < **b^hlēh₃-os-* (analysis by Meiser 1986: 9, 215–216); or rather, also based on **b^hleh₃-* ‘to blossom’, the following better founded alternative (based on Rix 1998 with modification): noun **b^he-b^hl(h₃)-o-* ‘what is blooming, sprouting’ = ‘vegetation; ivy’ (reduplicated form of the type **k^ue-k^ul(h₁)-o-* ‘what is turning’ = ‘wheel’) → transposite **b^he-b^hl(h₃)-o-h₃no-* ‘master of the vegetation / of ivy’ > Italic **fēβlōno-* > Sabellic **fōβlōn(o)s* (labial coloration *e* > *o*) > Palaeo-Umbrian **fōβlōns* (with long vowel *ō*) → Etruscan *FUFLUNS* = [*fuflūns*]. For the Common Italic coloration *e* > *o* between two tautosyllabic labials as in Sabellic **pompe* ‘five’ < **k^uénk^ue*, cf. the comparable reduplicated form Lat. *populus* ‘people’ ← ‘army’, Umbr. *poplo* ‘army’ < **peplo-* < **pe-pl(h₁)-o-* ‘group of lance throwers’ = ‘group brandishing lances’ from **pelh₁-* ‘to swing, brandish’ (etymology per Rix 1995: 82; cf. Gr. *πόλεμος* ‘war, fight’ < **pól(h₁)-mo-* ‘the brandishing of lances’). For the borrowing process of a morphonologically corresponding formation into Etruscan, cf. the theonym Etruscan *NEΘUNS* ← Palaeo-Umbrian **nehtūns* < **neftūns* (with long vowel *ū*) = Lat. *Neptūnus* < Italic **neptūno-* < transposite **neb^h-tu-h₃no-* ‘master of the wet element / of the moisture’.

5.6.2

In contrast to *vīnum*, attested in Latin since Livius Andronicus, the archaic expression *tēmētum* (Old Latin and poetic) was a general term for an intoxicating

drink, which was also used to refer to strong unmixed wine (also called *merum* ‘pure, unmixed wine’). Such a usage as a term for ‘wine’ is referred to by Paulus ex Festo 501, 6 (L): *temetum vinum, unde temulentia et temulentus*. It does not represent the old generic term for ‘wine’, however, as is also suggested by the related adjectives *tēmulentus* ‘drunk’, *abstēmius* ‘sober, abstemious’ ← **abs tēmō* ‘without intoxication’ from **tēm-o-* ‘intoxication, intoxicating substance’, which continues a vṛddhi derivative **tēmH-ó-* ‘characterized by fainting, leading to faint’ from **temH-* ‘to faint, become dark’ (related to Vedic *támyati* ‘faints’ < **tr̥H-je/o-*; see de Vaan 2008: 609 and cf. LEW 11 657, DELL 679–680, IEW 1063, LIV²: 624). That *tēmētum* could still be associated with *abstēmius* in classical times is obvious not only from Quintilian, *Institutio Oratoria* I 7–9 (‘*abstemius*’, *quia ex abstinencia temeti composita vox est*), but also from the testimony of Gellius, *Noctes Atticae* X 23, 1, according to which *tēmētum* is the designation for ‘wine’ in the ancient language:

Qui de victu atque cultu populi Romani scripserunt, mulieres Romae atque in Latio aetatem abstemias egisse, hoc est vino semper, quod ‘temetum’ prisca lingua appellabatur, abstinuisse dicunt.

Those who have written about the diet and the way of life of the Roman people, say that the women in Rome and Latium lived an abstemious life, that is, they abstained permanently from wine, which in the ancient language was called ‘temetum’.

Contrary to Agostiniani’s reasoning (1998: 9), however, this need not imply that *tēmētum* is the original designation for ‘wine’ in Latin and *vīnum* a term only secondarily introduced from outside, because in the passage given the word *tēmētum* was rather adduced for its antiquity and its apparent relationship to *abstēmius*, but not because it was a designation used exclusively in former times instead of the later current expression *vīnum*; and it has to be stressed that Lat. *vīnum* is already attested as early as Livius Andronicus, Ennius, Plautus, and Cato, i.e. in the earliest layer of literary texts, and appears as a base in old derivatives like *vīnea* f. ‘vineyard, rows of vine’, attested since the XII Tabulae, Plautus, and Cato. Besides, the transmission of lexical antiquities certainly does not go back to a time horizon beyond the 6th c. BC; in other words, it cannot reflect an epoch in which the lexeme *vīnum* was not yet in existence in the Italic languages. This reasoning is even consistent with Agostiniani’s own analysis, according to which this lexeme spread from Etruscan as a loanword within Italic, including Latino-Faliscan, from the end of the 8th c. BC (see above §5.6). The situation might in some respect be comparable to Greek,

where both *οἶνος* ‘wine’ and *μέθυ* ‘intoxicating drink, wine’ were inherited and already attested in Mycenaean and in both the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey*, but where *μέθυ* had fallen out of use by the classical epoch (see above §2).

5.7

Not acceptable is the derivation by Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995: 557) of Lat. *vīnum* from a supposedly inherited Italic form **ueḡno-* < IE **ueḡ(h₁)-no-*, because late Lat. *ī* (ca. 200 BC) < **eḡ* cannot be responsible for the attestations with <*i*> = /*i*/ occurring in Ancient Italy since the middle of the first millennium BC like Falisc. *UINO* etc. (see above §§5.1–2). Even if we assume an early borrowing from Latin at the stage of an older phonetic shape **ueḡnom* or start from **ueḡnom* as the Common Italic form underlying the attestations in the individual Italic languages, in Faliscan, Umbrian and Volscian this form would not lead to the attested form /*vīnom*/, but to **uēnom* (cf. Falisc. *hec* = Lat. *hīc*, OLat. *heic* < loc. **g^heḡ-ke*, Umbr. *eetu* /*ētu*/ = Lat. *ītō* < impvt. **eḡ-tōd*; see Beekes 1987: 22 with reference to Blümel 1972: 33–34 for the representation of diphthongs in the Italic languages).

5.8

As a result of the historically identifiable spread of viticulture to the North, Lat. *vīnum* was borrowed in turn into Celtic as the source of OIr. *fīn*, Welsh *gwin* and into Germanic as the source of Goth. *wein*, OE *wīn*, OHG *wīn*, which as a borrowing underlies OCS *vīno* and Lith. *vỹnas* (IEW 1121). On the basis of compounds such as Goth. *weina-gards*, OE *wīn-geard*, OHG *wīn-garto* ‘vineyard’ and OCS *vinjaga* ‘grape’, *vinogradz* ‘vineyard’, Gamkrelidze and Ivanov (1995: 557–558 with nn. 59, 60) suppose, however, that these are inherited forms from IE with their first compound member being genetically identical with Lat. *vīnum*, but not borrowed, and thus going back to IE **ueḡno-* or alternatively **uīno-*. However, these Germanic and Slavonic compound forms are certainly not of Proto-Germanic or Proto-Slavonic origin, but merely Common Germanic and Common Slavonic formations respectively and therefore young enough to contain word forms of the individual language branches, which are based on borrowings from Lat. *vīnum*.

6 Reconstruction

6.1

The evidence of the forms for ‘wine’ and ‘grapevine’ in the individual IE languages allows (in modification of the basic analysis by Beekes 1987: 24–25) the

reconstruction of an amphikinetic *nomen agentis* (*genus commune* = masc./fem.) of the type **spék-on-* ‘scout, spy, lookout’ (> YAv. *spasan-*, OHG *speho*): PIE **uēih₁-on-* (nom.sg. **uēih₁-ō(n)*)/obl. **uih₁-n’/loc.* **uēih₁-én* ‘twiner, creeping plant, tendril, grapevine’ from the verbal root **uēih₁-* ‘to wind around, to twine around’. (For PIE origin of the athematic *n*-stem meaning ‘grapevine’, see also Gorton 2014 with nn. 74–92; 2017: 2–8, 17–19.) The base form of the strong stem **uēih₁-on-* → **uēih₁-on-* shows *Schwebeablaut* before a vowel-initial suffix.

For prevocalic *Schwebeablaut* of a root morpheme containing a resonant in the onset and ending in a laryngeal, cf. inj.aor. **b^h(u)ueh₂-s/t* > OLat. subj. (*nē*) *fuās, fuat* ‘you shall / (s)he shall (not) be’ against subj.aor. **b^héueh₂-e-ti* > pres. Ved. *bhávati* ‘(s)he will be, becomes’; **pleh₁-* ‘fill (oneself)’ in Gr. *πίμπλημι* ‘I fill’, *πλήθω* ‘I fill myself, become full’, Lat. *plēnus* ‘full’ against **pólh₁-u/* **pélh₁-u-* ‘fullness’ ntr. > Gr. *πολύ* ntr. → *πολύς* ‘much’, Goth. *filu* ntr. ‘much’.

Cf. LIPP 2009b: 150–151 n. 62 with further refs.

A lexicalisation with similar semantics is to be seen in the verbal noun **uēih₁-ti-/* **uih₁-téi-* ‘the twining (around)’ → ‘twining twig, tendril, flexible branch’ = Lat. *vītis* ‘tendril, grapevine’ (by poetic metonymy ‘wine’), Lith. *vytis* ‘willow rod’. In proportional analogy to the zero grade **uih₁-*, a phonotactically renewed full grade **ueih₁-* corresponding to the normal root type *CeR(H)-* was introduced in YAv. *vaēiti-* ‘willow rod’ < **uēih₁-ti-* etc. (on the paradigmatic conditioning of the reshaped apophony, cf. Neri 2017: 324–325 with further refs.); perhaps the related form **uēih₁-on-* ‘twiner, grapevine’ (with prevocalic *Schwebeablaut*) also exerted some analogical influence.

6.2

It is possible that the type of *nomina agentis* like **spék-on-*, **uēih₁-on-* results from the hypostasis of locatives with postposition **-en*, thus **spék-on-* ‘scout, lookout’ = ‘being at looking out’ from loc. **spék-en* or **spek-én* ‘at looking out’ (from a root noun **spék-/* **spek-* ‘looking out’); hence **uēih₁-on-* ‘twiner, creeping plant’ = ‘being at twining, creeping around’ from loc. **uēih₁-én* ‘at twining, creeping around’ (from a root noun **uēih₁-/* **uih₁-* ‘the twining, creeping around’; see below §9.2). Under this perspective, the phonotactically regularised full grade of the root in **uēih₁-on-* would be due to its derivation from the zero-grade-containing form of the loc. **uēih₁-én* (the locative also providing the basis for the nominal stem **uēih₁-én-*, nom.sg. **uēih₁-én* ‘(stock) being at the grapevine’ > Proto-Greek **uēiēn* > Gk. *uíήν* Hesychius = **uēiēn* ‘vine-stock’; see below §8). For the type of derivation, cf. loc. **d^hgh^m-én* ‘on the earth’ (> Ved. *jmán*) → **d^hgh^m-on-* / **d^hgh^m-n-* ‘human being’ = ‘earthling, being on the earth’

(> Lat. *homō*, *-inis* etc.; cf. Nussbaum 1986: 187–190, 289–291, Lipp 2009b: 115–132 with further refs., Lipp forthcoming: §9.1.1).

A similar derivation has been proposed by Neri (2017: 324 n. 181), who takes Hitt. *uijan*- ‘wine’ as the substantivised continuant of the adjectival hypostasis **uih₁-on-* ‘belonging to the grapevine’ from the locative **uih₁-én* ‘at the grapevine’ (belonging to a root noun **uóih₁-*/**uih₁-* ‘twining plant’ = ‘willow; grapevine’). Apart from the fact that the root had the primary shape **uiéh₁-* forming a verifiable root noun **uiéh₁-*/**uih₁-* ‘the wrapping’ (see below §§9.1, 9.2), one has to keep in mind, however, that the primary meaning of Hitt. *uijan*- and Luw. *uijan-ī*/*uin-ī* (with *ī*-mutation in nom. + acc.) < **uih₁-on-* was ‘grapevine’, the meaning ‘wine’ in the case of Hitt. *uijan*(-a)- being secondary due to metonymy or hypostasis of the genitive (‘that of the grapevine’) or conditioned by derivation in the case of Luw. *uin-ī* (obl.) ‘wine’ < *uin-ija-* ‘pertaining to a grapevine’ (see above §§1.1, 1.1.1, 1.2 and below §7.1).

7 Morphological Representation of the Word for ‘Grapevine’ in Anatolian

7.1

PIE **uéh₁-on-*/loc. **uih₁-én*/obl. **uih₁-n-* led by generalisation of the zero grade of the root to Pre-Proto-Anatolian **uih₁-on-*/**uih₁-én(-i)*/**uih₁-n-* > Proto-Anatolian **uijon-*/**uijén(-i)*/**uĩn-* ‘grapevine’ > Hittite *uijan*- ‘grapevine’ and ‘wine’, the latter either by metonymy as ‘product from grapevine’ or by hypostasis from gen. *uijan-aš* ‘(that) of the grapevine’ displaying a thematic stem *uijan-a-* in the meaning ‘wine’ (the meaning ‘wine’ in Hittite then being restricted to the derivative; but the existence of a separate derivative *uijan-a-* ‘wine’ cannot be ascertained due to the ambiguity of the paradigmatic forms attested, see above §§1.1, 1.1.1, 1.1.3). Luwian *uijan-ī*/*uin-ī* ‘grapevine’ either displays Luw. *ī*-mutation in nom. + acc. of the *genus commune* on the basis of the strong stem (partially with Luw. contraction *ija* > *i*), or alternatively continues a hypostasis in the meaning ‘vine-stock’ = ‘(stock) being at the grapevine, (plant) consisting of grapevine’ from the locative **uijéni* ‘at/in the grapevine’ > Luw. *uijani* (with *é* > Luw. *a*).

7.2

For the Luwian formation, one can compare the *ī*-mutation in an athematic stem like nom.acc. PIE **dʰéǵʰ-ōm* ‘earth’ (→ Post-PIE **dʰǵʰóm* > Gr. *χθών* etc.) > Proto-Anatolian **dégom* (*genus commune*; Hitt. <*te-e-kán*> = */dégan/* ntr. secondary) → Pre-Proto-Luwian **deyom-ī+s/m* (with animate-marker **-ī* in *genus*

commune as relic of **ih₂/iéh₂-* corresponding to the type Ved. *dev-ī/gen. dev-yās* f. ‘goddess’ > nom. **deⁱom-ī-s*, acc. **deⁱom-ī-m* (intervocalic loss of *g* > *γ* with insertion of *i* as hiatus filler after front vowel), whence by analogy dat.-loc. **deⁱom-ī* > Proto-Luwian nom. **diḡamm-ī-s*, acc. **diḡamm-ī-n*, dat.-loc. **diḡamm-ī* (raising of pretonic *e* to *i*; fortis realisation resp. gemination of the nasal before following accent) > CLuw. nom. *tīḡammiš*, acc. *tīḡammin*, dat.-loc. *tīḡammi* = */diḡammīs/*, */diḡammīn/*, */diḡammī/*. But for this Luwian word for ‘earth’, there is also the alternative analysis as a locative hypostasis (Kimball 1994a: 78, 84–85 with n. 29), thus loc. PIE **d^hǵ^hém(-i)* > Proto-Anatolian **daǵém(i)* > 1. loc. Hitt. *tagān* = */daǵān/* ‘on the earth/ground’, 2. locative Pre-Proto-Luwian **daǵém(i)* > **daǵém(mi)* (palatalization of velar or rather intervocalic loss of *g* > *γ* with insertion of *i* as hiatus filler before front vowel; nasal gemination according to Lex Čop) > Proto-Luwian **diḡám(mi)* ‘on the earth/ground’ → hypostasis CLuw. *tīḡammi-* = */diḡámmi-/* c. ‘earth, land, ground’ (= **‘being located on the earth?’*). (See Lipp 2009b: 56–60 with further refs.).

7.3

For the Anatolian forms, Oettinger (2003: 143–144) offers however the following hypothesis based on the assumption that their sound shape was conditioned by Anatolian vowel breaking: PIE **uóǵh₂no-* ‘wine’ (= Greek *οἶνος* m.) > Proto-Anatolian **uēno-* > Hitt. *uiḡana-* (breaking); **uóǵh₂no-* ‘wine’ → **uóǵh₂ni-* ‘grapevine’ > Proto-Anatolian **uēni-* > Luw. **uīni-* > HLuw. *uiḡani-* (breaking), by restitution also *uīni-*. But in this scenario it remains unclear under which conditions the breaking of *ē* and *ī* (as against their preservation in other lexemes and paradigms) and the partial restitution of inherited *ī* take place (no conditioning by accent, chronological or dialectal distribution being recognizable; for the material, see above §§1.1, 1.2). On the other hand, vowel breaking must indeed be admitted as an irregular phenomenon, e.g. CLuw. *miḡasa-* ntr. ‘flesh’ (nom.acc. *mi-īa-ša-an-za* = */miḡasan^hsa/*) beside *mīsa-* ntr. ‘id.’ = */mīsa-/* (nom.acc. *mi-i-ša-an-za*, *mi-ša-an-za* = */mīsan^hsa/*) < **mēs-a-* < PIE **més* ntr. < ***mém-s* ~ PIE **mēms-ó-* (Ved. *mās-* ~ *māms-á-*, Goth. *mimz* ntr. etc.; interpretation and etymological analysis of CLuw. *mi(īa)sa-* according to Poetto 1995: 30, 34–35; for the attestations, cf. also Melchert 1993: 149, ACLT s.v. CLuw. *mi(ya)sa-* ntr. ‘flesh’). But one has to keep in mind that the Hittite form of the word for ‘grapevine’ is represented by the athematic *n*-stem *uiḡan-*, and the Hittite word for ‘wine’ is either identical with it due to metonymic extension of the denotation or represents a thematic hypostasis *uiḡan-a-** based on *uiḡan-* (the underlying stem formation of the attested paradigmatic forms being ambiguous, see above §§1.1, 1.1.1, 1.1.3). For the explanation of the Anatolian forms, one therefore has to start from an inherited athematic base form **uiḡan-* in the

meaning ‘grapevine’ (not ‘wine’), and this form cannot be derived from a thematic form **uóih₁no-* corresponding to Gr. *οἶνος* ‘wine’ and containing preconsonantal **oi* in the root morpheme, which would provide the starting point for the alleged Anatolian phonological development consisting of the monophthongization of the diphthong to **ē* (> **ī*) and subsequent vowel breaking to **īa* (and †*uoī(h₁)-n-* as an independent athematic stem of the *genus commune* is neither morphologically nor apophonically admissible).

But in this respect H.C. Melchert (p.c.; similarly already Gérard 2009: 20) has pointed out as a decisive argument that before coronal continuants, the inherited diphthong **oi* was not monophthongized in Anatolian, but according to Kimball was retained as *ai* in Hittite (as exemplified for the position before *n* or tautosyllabic *s*, just as also inherited **ou* and **au* were not monophthongized before resonants; Kimball 1994b: 14–22, 13–14, Kimball 1999: 216, 225–226; followed by Melchert 1994: 148 with the assumption of a broader context of preservation of the respective diphthongs before coronal continuants). Therefore, the presumed **oi* cannot provide the monophthongization product **ē* as input for the vowel breaking to **īa*. For the precoronal retention of *ai* < **oi*, cf. Hitt. ¹⁰*kaina-* ‘relative by marriage’ < PIE **kói₁no-* (cf. Ved. *śéva-* ‘friendly, dear’, OHG *hīwa*, Latv. *siēva* ‘wife’ < **kéi₁-uo-/ueh₂-*, OIr. *coim* ‘dear’ < **kói₁mo-*); Hitt. *šui₁aiš* ‘bird’ < **suo₁i-s* (with shortening by Osthoff’s law) < PIE **suó₁i-s*, nom. of **(s)h₂uó₁i-/*(s)h₂uē₁i-* (Ved. *váy-*, nom. *vés*, Lat. *avis*).

7.4

Hitt. */uiian-/* c. ‘wine; grape-vine’ < Proto-Anatolian **uúion-* < **uúih₁-on-* with gen.sg. Hitt. GEŠTIN-*ia-na-aš* = *ui₅-ia-na-aš* < **uúion-os*, instr.sg. Hitt. *ú-i-ia-an-ta* < **uúion-d* shows generalization of the stem formant **-on-* after the strong stem of the amphikinetic paradigm Proto-Anatolian **uúion-/uúin-* < **uúih₁-on-/uúih₁-n-*. A comparable paradigmatic structure is offered by Hitt. nom.sg. *hāraš*, acc.sg. *hāranan* → gen.sg. *hāranaš* ‘eagle’ (for the Hittite paradigm, cf. Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 111–112) with apophonic levelling within the original amphikinetic paradigm PIE **h₃ér-on-* : oblique **h₃r-n-* (nom.sg. PIE **h₃ér-ō(n)* = **[h₃ór-ō]* > Proto-Anatolian **h₃óro+s* > Hitt. *hāraš*). The original apophony of the stem formant is reflected by OHG *aro* ‘eagle’ < Proto-Germanic **ar-ō* < PIE **h₃ér-ō(n)* : OHG *arn* < **arn-i-*, ON *grn* < **arn-u-* ‘id.’ < Proto-Germanic **ar-n-* < **ur-n-* < PIE **h₃r-n-*. (For the apophonic structure of the paradigm of **h₃ér-on-* ‘eagle’, see Harðarson 1987: 118–122 and also Melchert 1983: 8–9, 10, Zucha 1988: 170–171, 172–173.)

The original PIE paradigm underlying Hitt. */uiian-/* c. ‘wine; grapevine’ thus was neither proterokinetic nor hysterokinetic. This also becomes clear from the diverging paradigm structure in the following two examples.

- (1) Hitt. *išḫiman-/išḫimen-* c. ‘cord, rope’ with nom.sg. *išḫimāš*, acc.sg. *išḫimanan* → *išḫimenan* (on the analogy of the oblique stem as in unattested gen.sg. *išḫimenas**; for the Hittite paradigm, see Hoffner and Melchert 2008: 111–112) on the basis of a proterokinetic paradigm **sh₂éḫ-mon-* : obl. **sh₂i-mén-* with nom.sg. **sh₂éḫ-mō(n)* = **[sh₂áḫ-mō]* → Proto-Anatolian **sh₂i-mō+s* > Hitt. *išḫimāš* (= OSax. *sīmo*, OE *sīma* ‘rope’ < Proto-Germanic **sīmō* < **sih₂-mō* with laryngeal metathesis and probably analogical suffix accent after acc.sg. **sih₂-món-ṛ* < **sh₂i-món-ṛ*). For the stem formation, cf. Gr. *ἰμωνιά* ‘well-rope’ < **simon-īā*, due to a remodelling in the acc.sg. **sh₂i-món-ṛ* ← PIE **sh₂eḫ-món-ṛ* = **[sh₂aḫ-món-ṛ]* < **sh₂éḫ-mon-ṛ* under the influence of the oblique stem PIE **sh₂i-mén-*, likewise displaying suffix accent.

On the PIE accent shift in trisyllabic words with the vowel structure *é-o-V* → *e-ó-V* as in the case of the PIE numeral **k^uetuóres* m. ‘four’ < **k^uétuores*, the so-called “*k^uetuóres* rule” postulated by Klingenschmitt, cf. Lipp 2009b: 96 with n. 143 and further refs. For the apophonic structure of the paradigm, see Harðarson 1987: 118–122, partially different Melchert 1983: 10, Zucha 1988: 170–171 with n. 28; 172–173.

- (2) Hitt. *ištanzan-* c. ‘soul’ with nom.sg. *ZI-an-za* = *ištanza**, gen.sg. *ištanzanaš* based on a hysterokinetic paradigm **pst-én-* : obl. **pst-n-* with nom.sg. **pst-én* > Proto-Anatolian **stén+s* > Hitt. *ištanza**. For the etymology, cf. Ved. *stána-* m., YAv. *fštāna-* m., Arm. *stin* ‘female breast’, Gr. *στήνιον*· *στήθος* (Hesychius) ‘breast’.

For the apophonic structure, see Harðarson 1987: 118–122 on the basis of the etymological analysis by Eichner 1973: 98 n. 78, which however has been disputed by HED 1/11 471, Kloekhorst 2008: 415, cf. EWAia II 752.

8 The Inherited Greek Word for ‘Grapevine’

By hypostasis of the locative **uīh₁-én* ‘at/in the grapevine/tendrill’ in the prehistory of Greek there was formed a new nominal stem **uīh₁-én-*, nom.sg. **uīh₁-én* ‘(stock) being at the grapevine, (plant) consisting of grapevine/tendrill’ > Proto-Gr. **uīḡén* > Gr. *νίην*, ἢ *νιόν*· *τὴν ἀμπέλων* (Hesychius), to be interpreted as **fīḡyn* ‘grapevine, vine-stock’. For the internal derivation, cf. Ved. RV+ *pári-jman-* adj. ‘being all around, ubiquitous’ ← RV *pári-jman* adv. ‘all around’ < **párijmán* loc. ‘all around on earth’ (RV *jmán* loc. ‘on earth’).

A comparable constellation of internal derivation based on a locative (without derivational suffix) can be seen in the *s*-stem **h₂ép-os/*

**h₂ep-és*- ntr. ‘work, opus’ with loc. **h₂ep-és(-i)* ‘at work’ > Ved. *ápas/apás-* ‘work’ with loc. *apási* and in the adjectival hypostasis (derived from the locative) **h₂ep-és-* ‘being at work’ (nom.sg. **h₂ep-és*), continued in the Ved. adjective *apás-* ‘working, active’. For the vocalism of the derivative, cf. Gr. *ψεῦδής* ‘lying, false’ as derivative of the *s*-stem *ψεῦδος* ntr. ‘lie, falsehood’ with dative *ψεῦδει* < loc. **-és-i*.

See LIPP 2009b: 120 with further refs., following J. SCHINDLER

9 Etymological Connections of the PIE Word for ‘Grapevine’

9.1

PIE **u₁éh₁-on-* ‘twiner, creeping plant, grapevine’ is a *nomen agentis* based on the verbal root **u₁eh₁-* ‘to wind around, to twine around’ (LIV²: 695), which is represented e.g. in the thematic aor. Ved. *ávyat* ‘has enwrapped’ ← root aor. 3 pl. **u₁ánt*, remodelled on the stem of root aor.sg. **u₁á* < PIE **u₁éh₁-* from 3.pl. **u₁ánt* < PIE **u₁ih₁-ént*, further in pres. Ved. *vyáyati* ‘enwraps’ ← **u₁íáia-* (after aor. *vyá-* ← **u₁íá-*) = Lat. *vieō, -ēre* ‘to bind, twist’ < iterative **u₁ih₁-éie/o-* (non-coloration of the stem suffix proves **h₁* and excludes **h₂* as final root consonant: *†u₁ih₂-éie-* > *†u₁ih₂aiē-* > Lat. *†viāre*), and in Lith. *vejù* (*výti*) ‘to wind’ < **u₁éh₁-e/o-* ← ***u₁éh₁-e/o-* (Schwebeablaut before vowel-initial suffix, see above §6.1). From Ved. *vyáyati* ‘enwraps’ ← PIE **u₁ih₁-éie/o-* one has to distinguish etymologically the phonologically and semantically similar verb in pres. Ved. *váyati* ‘weaves’ < PIE **Hu₁-éie/o-*, perf. Ved. *ūvur* ‘they have woven’ (< **Hu₁-Hu₁-ís* ← **He₁-Hu₁-ís*), verbal adj. *vy-ūta-* ‘woven’ from **Heu₁*, further Lith. *áudžiu, áusti* ‘to weave’ < **Heu₁-d-* (LIV²: 224).

9.2

In Avestan, the related root noun *viiā-* is still attested occasionally in the basic (i.e. not derivationally conditioned) lexical meaning ‘wrapping, envelopment’. The acc.sg. OAv. *viiqm* is measured as bisyllabic (either */u₁ia’am/* as reflex of PIE **u₁éh₁-m* or */u₁iiām/* as lexicalised Lindeman variant from PIE **u(i)íém* < ***u₁éh₁-m*, if Stang’s law applied not only to ***oah₂m* > **ām*, but also to ***oeh₁m* > **ēm*; on occasional reflexes of Sievers and Lindeman variants in Old Avestan, see Schindler 1977: 58–59, cf. Lipp 2009b: 357 n. 18): Yasna 48,7 b-c *yōi ā vanhāuš manahō dīdrayžō.duiē //* *ašā vīqm* ‘you, who wish to tighten the envelopment of good thinking in accordance with the right order’. Further forms of the loc.pl. occur in Yašt 13,11 f-g *viiāhuua uruuat.caēm astica gaonaca* ‘in the wombs (= envelopments) I put together bones and hairs’; Yašt 8,9 b–d *satauuāēsō...viiāhuua yat jasaiti* ‘when (the rain-bringing star) Satavaēsa goes

to his hiding places (= shells, envelopments by the clouds)' (cf. Humbach 1959: 78, Schindler 1972: 70, Kellens 1984: 56, 340, Kellens and Pirart 1988: 170; 1990: 308; 1991: 224, Humbach 1991: 201–202). In PIE this particular root noun was probably a *nomen actionis* with the meaning 'wrapping, envelopment', which displayed mobile accent and therefore the stem allomorphs **u₁éh₁-*/**u₁ih₁-* (i.e. not the acrostatic pattern **u₁íóh₁-*/**u₁íéh₁-* of a *nomen agentis* or *resultativum*), and therefore the Hesychius gloss Gr. γίς· ἰμάς 'belt' taken as **fíz* = **u₁ís* < Pre-Proto-Gr. **u₁ih₁-s* 'the wrapping' (← PIE **u₁éh₁-s*) can be connected as a formation with generalised zero grade of the root.

10 Morphological Representation of the Words for 'Wine' in Italic and Greek

10.1

Lat. *vīnum*, Falisc. */vīnom/*, Umbr. */vīno^m/* 'wine' etc. < Proto-Italic **u₁īno-* < PIE **u₁ih₁no-* is derivationally analysable as **u₁ih₁-n-ó-*, i.e. an original adjectival possessive derivation based on the oblique (weak) stem of PIE **u₁éh₁on-/obl.* **u₁ih₁-n-* 'grapevine, tendril' (stem variant as in Luw. */u₁in-ī-* 'wine' < *u₁in-i₁a-* < **u₁īn-i₁ó-* 'pertaining to a grapevine'; see above §1.2), which has the derivational meaning 'having/containing grapevine, consisting of grapevine' → neuter 'Rebensaft: grape juice, must, wine' (in Italic lexicalised as a noun). For possessive adjectives derived from the oblique stem, cf. Ved. *tamasá-* 'dark-coloured' < **temH-es-ó-* 'having darkness, consisting of darkness' belonging to Ved. *támas-* 'darkness' ntr. < PIE **témH-os*/**temH-és-* ← **témH-os*/**tṃH-és-*, and Gr. βίός m. 'bow' < **g^uih₂-ó-* 'having a tendon/string, provided with a tendon' to Ved. *jyā-* f. < **g^uíéh₂-*/**g^uih₂-* 'tendon'.

For Italic possessive derivatives based on the oblique stem, cf. Lat. *salvus* 'sound, unharmed' = Osc. *σαλαψ*, *SALAVS*, Umbr. *saluom*, *saluuom* (< Proto-Sabellic **sala_uo-*) < Proto-Italic **sala_uo-* = OP *fra-haravam* adv. 'entirely, altogether' < Indo-Iranian **sər-au-á-* < **sr̥H-au-á-* < PIE **[s₁h₂au₁ó-]* = **s₁h₂-eu-ó-* (accent like Gr. κενός 'empty' < **ken-eu₁ó-*). These forms are etymologically related to CLuw. *šalhitti-* 'growth' < **s₁h₂-i-ti-* to Hitt. *šalli-*, CLuw. *šalha/i-* 'grown, adult' ← adj. **sélh₂-i-*/**s₁h₂-é₁-*. PIE **s₁h₂-eu-ó-* in the meaning 'having health/welfare' is a possessive formation based on the oblique stem of the neuter noun **sólh₂-u/obl.* **s₁h₂-é₁-* 'health, welfare' (← **sólh₂-u/obl.* **sélh₂-u-*, originally belonging to the acrostatic type **gón-u/obl.* **gén-u-* → **ǵn-é₁-* 'knee'). This noun is continued 1. by the Italic noun **sal-u-*/**sal-ou-* ← **s₁h₂-u-*/**s₁h₂-au-* (← PIE **sólh₂-u-*/**s₁h₂-é₁-*)

as base of the secondary Lat. *salūs*, *-ūtis* ‘health, welfare’ < **salou-ti-*; and 2. by the Ved. adverb *pra-salaví* ‘entirely, altogether’ < Proto-Indo-Iranian loc. **sar-áu-i* belonging to **sár-u*/**sar-áu-* < **sálH-u*/**salH-áu-* < **sólh₂-u*/**solh₂-áu-* (← PIE **sólh₂-u*/**słh₂-éu-*; see Lipp 2009b: 339–341 and nn. 64, 66 for refs.).

10.2

10.2.1

Gr. *οἶνος* m. ‘wine’, Myc. *wo-no* = */uoino-/* etc. < Proto-Gr. **uóino-* < PIE **uó(h₁)no-* (laryngeal loss according to Lex Saussure, see above §2) is analysable in its derivation as **uóih₁-n-o-* ‘Rebensaft: grape juice, must, wine’ ← **uóih₁-n-ó-* ‘having/containing grapevine, consisting of grapevine’, i.e. as an early substantivisation of an archaic adjectival possessive formation, characterised by *o*-grade of the root and initial accent. The adjectival possessive formation **uóih₁-n-ó-* is probably derived from the strong stem of PIE **uéih₁-on-/obl.* **uih₁-n-* ‘tendrill, grapevine’ (by paradigmatic levelling Pre-Proto-Anatolian **uih₁-on-* > Hitt. *uiian(a)-* ‘grapevine; wine’); morphologically and functionally comparable is e.g. Goth. *hals*, Lat. *collum*, OLat. *collus* ‘neck’ < **kólso-* (*k* < *k^u* by delabialisation before rounded vowel *o*) < PIE **k^uólso-* ‘joint for a turning motion’ ← **k^uolsó-* (Lex Saussure: *oR.C* < *oRH.C*, see above §§2, 3) < **k^uolh₁-s-ó-* ‘having a turning motion, performing a turning motion’ as derivative of the verbal noun **k^uélh₁-os/-és-* ntr. ‘turning (motion)’ > Gr. *τέλος* ‘end’ = **‘turning point’*. The archaic formation of the underlying possessive adjectives **uóih₁-n-ó-* and **k^uolh₁-s-ó-* shows a morphologically conditioned *o*-grade of the root morpheme, which was unaccented in the derivative, but accented in the derivational bases **uéih₁-on-* c. and **k^uélh₁-os* ntr. respectively. Such derivations might have provided a prototype for substantivisations with the *vṛddhi* vowel **-o-* (for such analyses, see below §10.2.2). From these formations, one must however distinguish younger and more frequent possessive formations with *e*-grade of the root like possibly **k^uelh₁-s-ó-* ‘having a turning point, being at the turning point’ (> Welsh *pell* ‘far’, on which see Neri’s different analysis in the next paragraph); cf. the derivation from the base **kér-u-* ‘horn, point’ (> Ved. *śáru-* f. RV ‘arrow, spear’) in the case of PIE **kér-u-ó-* ‘having horns, horned’ or **kér-u-o-* ‘animal having horns, horned animal’ > Lat. *cervus* ‘stag, deer’ beside a probably older and therefore already Pre-PIE formation **kor-u-ó-* ‘having horns, horned’ → PIE **kór-u-o-* ‘horned animal, cattle’ (early lexicalised form without later satem palatalisation like in the base form **kér-u-* < **kér-u-*) → Balto-Slavic **kórŭ-ā-* f. ‘cow’ (*vṛddhi* derivation meaning **‘the female belonging to the horned animal’*) > RussCS *krava*, Lith. *kárvė* (< **-iŭā-*) ‘id.’ (on the formation type, see Lipp 2009a: 14 and n. 21; 60–61 and n. 161 with further refs.,

Lipp forthcoming: §9.3.2; Lat. *corvus* ‘crow, raven’ could be related as *‘animal with horny beak’ from **kór-u-o-* ‘horned animal’, but in general an onomatopoeic origin is assumed for this form).

For substantivisation with initial accent, cf. the derivations PIE **u̯l̥kʷó-* ‘dangerous’ (Ved. *a-vṛká-* ‘harmless’ = *‘undangerous’ and Hitt. *u̯alku(u)a-* ntr. ‘monstrosity’, if not from **u̯el̥kʷo-* ‘the dangerous thing’) → PIE **u̯l̥kʷo-* ‘dangerous animal’ (Luw. *u̯al̥ua-/u̯al̥ui-* ‘lion’, Ved. *vṛka-*, Gr. *λύκος* etc. ‘wolf’), Ved. *kṛṣṇá-* ‘black’ → *kṛṣṇa-* ‘black antelope’, **anná-* ‘eaten’ → *ánna-* ‘food’, Gr. *λευκός* ‘white’ → *λεῦκος* ‘white fish’, *λεύκη* ‘abele, white poplar’, *δολιχός* ‘long’ → *δόλιχος* ‘long run’ (cf. Lipp 2009b: 144–145 with refs.). For the substantivisation of a possessive formation, cf. (as derivative of **rót-o-* ‘the running, the rolling motion/device’ = OHG *rad* ‘wheel’ etc. → **rót-h₂*/**rot-éh₂-* ‘roller, wheel’ = Lat. *rota* ‘wheel’) the possessive adj. **roth₂-ó-* ‘having wheels’ → substantive **róth₂-o-* ‘chariot’ = Ved. *rátha-*, Av. *raθa-* ‘chariot’ (see Lipp 2009b: 387 n. 87; 453 with refs.).

10.2.2

A different derivation for Gr. *οἶνος* m. ‘wine’ < **u̯óǵ(h₁)no-* is proposed by Neri (2017: 324 n. 181), who regards it as a barytone substantivisation with *o*-grade on the basis of a *vṛddhi* derivative **u̯eǵh₁-n-ó-* ‘belonging to the grapevine’, i.e. as a formation like the aforementioned (but in 10.2.1. differently analysed) form Goth. *hals* ‘neck’ < Germ. **h^(w)alsa-* < **kʷól(h₁)-s-o-* < **kʷel̥h₁-s-ó-* ‘having a turning motion/point’ > Welsh *pell* ‘far’ (= *‘having a turning point, being at the turning point’), and Lith. *žāstas* (2) ‘upper arm’ < **ǵʰós-to-* < **ǵʰes-tó-* ‘belonging to the hand’. In Neri’s analysis, **u̯eǵh₁-n-ó-* is a thematic hypostasis of a locative **u̯ih₁-én* ‘at the grapevine’ (→ **u̯ih₁-on-* ‘belonging to the grapevine’ > Hitt. *u̯iian-* ‘wine’) from a root noun **u̯óǵh₁-*/**u̯ih₁-* ‘twining plant’ = ‘willow; grapevine’ (the existence of which cannot be ascertained, however; see above §§6.2, 9.2).

According to Gippert (1994: 119 n. 16), on the other hand, Gr. *οἶνος* m. ‘wine’ < **u̯óǵino-* < **u̯óǵ(H)no-* continues a substantivisation with secondary *o*-grade *vṛddhi* in the meaning ‘grape’ = ‘the fruit belonging to the twining plant/grapevine’, which is derived from the verbal adjective **u̯iH-nó-* ‘twined’, whose neuter form meaning ‘twining plant, grapevine’ is continued by Lat. *vīnum* ‘wine’. The Armenian form *gini*, gen. *ginwoy* ‘wine’ < **u̯ēñio-* < **u̯oǵ(H)nio-* is assumed to be an *-io-* derivative from **u̯óǵ(H)no-* ‘grape’ with the meaning ‘wine’ as designation for the product made from grapes. The Anatolian forms like Hitt. *u̯iian(a)-* ‘grapevine; wine’ would however be based on different derivations from the respective verbal root.

11 The Semitic Evidence

The earliest attestations of Semitic **uainu* 'wine' are represented by the Old Canaanite forms *ie-nu*, *ie-ni* (14th c. BC) from Akkadian diplomatic texts in the Egyptian archive of Tell el-Amarna. In the textual tradition of the respective Semitic languages there are the following attestations: Ugaritic *yn* = */yēnu/* 'wine' (13th c. BC; cf. Aistleitner 1967: 130–131 Nr. 1183, del Olmo Lete and Sanmartín 2003: 968–971, for the retrieval of the forms, see Zemánek 1995: esp. 121–122), Phoenician *yn* = */yēn/*, Old Aramaic *yyn*, Hebrew *yyn*, vocalised *yayin* (Samaritan Ostraca *yn* = */yēn/*), Ammonite *yn* = */yēn/* 'wine' (each of these forms showing the Northwest Semitic change of initial **u- > i-*); Old Sabaean *wyn*, *yyn* 'vineyard' (with vacillation between *u-* and *i-*); Ethiopic (Ge'ez) *wayən* 'wine, grapevine, vineyard'; further only occasionally attested Arabian *wayn* 'black grapes'. (On the Semitic forms and their possible interdependence with IE and non-IE forms, cf. Brown 1969: 147–148, Koehler and Baumgartner 1974: 391, Cohen 1996: 534, Lipiński 1997: 561, Zamora 2000: 269, 270, 274, Leslau 2006: 623, Aspesi 2013, Gorton 2014 with nn. 28–38, 105–111; assumption of a borrowing from Hittite by Rabin 1963: 138–139, unconvincing attempt at an etymological connection of the lexeme within Semitic by van Selms 1974, which is rejected by Aspesi 2013: 6 with n. 22, Gorton 2014 with n. 37).

The lexeme in question is represented only in West Semitic, not in East Semitic, as the traditionally connected form Akkad. *inu* appears only in Young Babylonian lexicographical lists and as such is not old and also of unknown meaning (CAD 7: 152 s.v. *inu* C, 157 s.v. *īnu* 1.(e)l, Rabin 1963: 138 n. 8 versus AHw I 383). Since ancient times, the normal expression in East Semitic for 'wine' has been Akkad. *karānu* (also 'grape, grapevine'), often rendered by the Sumerian logogram GEŠTIN. And because of the phonotactic structure of its potential root element (**uīn*), **uainu* is also without an inner-Semitic etymological connection. But also as a borrowing it would not be derivable from the Anatolian forms Hitt. *uijan(a)-* 'wine; grapevine', HLuv. *uijani-*, *uini-* 'grapevine' (< **uih₁-on-*/**uih₁-n-*; see above §§1.1, 1.1.1, 1.2, 7.1).

The following hypothesis, however, might offer a solution: The lexeme **uainu* could have been borrowed into Northwest Semitic (Ugaritic + Aramaic + Canaanite [= Phoenician, Hebrew, Moabitic, Ammonite]) around 1500 BC by way of the Levant trade from Mycenaean, where in the textual evidence of Linear B the word is attested as *wo-no* = */uoino-/* 'wine' (> later Greek *οἶνος*; see above §2).

As according to the evidence from Amorite names in Akkadian and Egyptian sources and from Old Syrian and Old Canaanite glosses in the correspondence from Tell el-Amarna (cf. Moscati 1964: 46) the Northwest Semitic initial

change $*\mu- > i-$ had already taken place by the first quarter of the second millennium BC, one can suppose that the lexeme $*\mu a i n u$ as a loan form, which was taken over from Mycenaean only in the middle of the second millennium BC, would first have preserved its initial $*\mu-$ in Northwest Semitic and as such would soon have spread from the Northwest Semitic area further within the Semitic group to the south (into North and South Arabian, Ethiopic).

As by the earlier Northwest Semitic sound change $*\mu- > i-$ all former instances of initial $*\mu-$ had been removed, it is easily conceivable that after some time a secondary sound substitution of new isolated cases of initial $*\mu-$ would have occurred as in the loanword $*\mu a i n u$ 'wine', which therefore within Northwest Semitic changed secondarily for structural reasons into $*i a i n u$. Thus only in specific phonetic constellations or still later acquired lexemes was initial μ -preserved in Northwest Semitic, as for instance in the case of the proclitic conjunction $*\mu a-$ 'and' > Ugarit. Phoen. $w-$, Hebr. Aram. $wə-$ corresponding to Arab. $wa-$ and Akkad. $u < * \mu a-$ (cf. Moscati 1964: 46, 121, Sivan 2001: 25–26).

12 Conclusion

To sum up: In historical linguistic analysis, the set of forms of the word for 'wine' represented in the individual Indo-European languages can be derived from a formation based on the PIE root $*\mu i e h_1-$ 'to wind around, to twine around', i.e. a nominal nasal stem PIE $*\mu é i h_1-on-/obl. * \mu i h_1-n-/loc. * \mu i h_1-én$ 'twiner, creeping plant, tendril, grapevine' (with Schwebeablaut of the full grade of the root morpheme before the vowel-initial suffix). This athematic stem is continued on the one hand by Hittite $\mu i i a n-$ c. 'wine; grapevine' (whether the meaning 'wine' was restricted to a thematic hypostasis $\mu i i a n-a-$ cannot be decided in view of the ambiguity of the paradigmatic forms attested) and Hieroglyphic Luwian $\mu i i a n i-$, $\mu i n i-$ c. 'grapevine' (with generalized zero grade of the root). On the other hand, it provides the derivational base for the possessive formations 1. $*\mu o i (h_1)-n-ó-$ 'consisting of grapevine' (from the strong stem $*\mu é i h_1-on-$) $\rightarrow$ noun $*\mu ó i n-o-$ 'juice from grapevine, grape juice, Rebensaft' > Greek $(\varphi) \sigma \nu \sigma$ m. 'wine', Armenian $gini$ 'wine' ($< * \mu o i n-i j o-m$ ntr. $< * \mu o i n-i h_2-ó- \leftarrow * \mu ó i n-o-$) and 2. $*\mu i h_1-n-ó-$ 'consisting of grapevine' (from the weak stem $*\mu i h_1-n-$) $\rightarrow$ Proto-Italic $*\mu i n o m$ ntr. 'juice from grapevine, grape juice, Rebensaft' > Latin $v i n u m$, Faliscan $/v i n o^m/$, Umbrian $/v i n o^m/$ 'wine'; under this assumption the Etruscan form $V I N U N$, $V I N U M$ continues a loan adopted from an Italic language no later than the 7th century BC. A debatable alternative is offered by Agostiniani's analysis, according to which the Italic forms are borrowed from the Etruscan language, which in turn would have taken over this lexeme from

Greek, i.e. Common Italic /*uīnom*/ ← Etruscan *VINUN*, *VINUM* ← accusative Greek *uoinon**. The Semitic forms Ugaritic *yn* = /*yēnu*/, Phoenician *yn* = /*yēn*/, Hebrew *yayin* ‘wine’, etc. < **uainu* may be based on a borrowing in the mid-2nd millennium BC from Mycenaean Greek (Linear B *wo-no* = /*uoino*-/), whereas the source of the Caucasian forms Georgian *yvino*, Mingrelian *gvini* ‘wine’ is probably a loan acquired during the 1st millennium BC from Proto-Armenian or its prestage (Proto-Kartvelian **γuinio* ← [Pre-]Proto-Armenian **gūinīō*, gen. **gūinīōio* < **uoin-īō* = Armenian *gini*, gen. *ginwoy*).

Acknowledgements

This paper presented at the Hrozný memorial conference in Prague in November 2015 is based on a joint talk given with Bela Brogyanyi at the III Convegno IRDAU in Perugia and Gubbio in September 2011 (Brogyanyi and Lipp 2016). In the present version, special attention has been paid to the Anatolian and Italic evidence. For valuable advice on the formation and attestation of the words for ‘grapevine’ and ‘wine’ in Anatolian I would like to thank Craig Melchert and Massimo Poetto, who have also generously provided me with important bibliographical references. Further references I owe to Marianna Pozza. I am also indebted to Ilya Yakubovich for making accessible precious archival material, and to Luke Gorton for putting his unpublished PhD thesis at my disposal (Gorton 2014). For advice on Semitic issues, I would like to thank my department colleagues Viktor Bielický and Pavel Čech. I would also like to acknowledge the utmost care taken by the volume editor Ronald Kim in processing my typographically complex text and in improving the style of the paper. For substantial suggestions and support in providing research literature, I am grateful to my friends Bela Brogyanyi, Martin Gális and Sergio Neri. The research for this paper has been supported by the Czech Science Foundation in the form of projects GA 14-10673S and GA 14-12987S and by Charles University in Prague within the project ‘Progres 4: Language in the shiftings of time, space, and culture’.

Bibliography

- ACLT = I. Yakubovich (principal investigator), *Annotated Corpus of the Luwian Language*, <http://web-corpora.net/LuwianCorpus/search/> (accessed 14.05.2016).
 Agostiniani, L. (1998) Sull'origine del nome del vino in etrusco e nelle altre lingue dell'Italia antica, in: L. Agostiniani et al. (eds.), *do-ra-qe pe-re. Studi in memoria di*

- Adriana Quattordio Moreschini, Roma: Istituti editoriali e poligrafici internazionali, 1–13.
- AHw I = Wolfram von Soden (1965) *Akkadisches Handwörterbuch*, Band I: A–L, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Aistleitner, J. (1967) *Wörterbuch der ugaritischen Sprache*, hg. von Otto Eißfeldt, Berlin: Akademie-Verlag (Dritte, durchgesehene und ergänzte Auflage).
- Aspesi, F. (2013 [2012–2013]) *Sacro vino, Ἀλεξάνδρεια/Alessandria 6–7 (= ΦΙΛΟΙΝ – Scritti in onore di Mario Enrietti e Renato Gendre)*, 3–17.
- Bakkum, G.C.L.M. (2009) *The Latin Dialect of the Ager Faliscus: 150 Years of Scholarship*, 2 parts, Amsterdam: Amsterdam University Press.
- Beekes, R.S.P. (1987) On Indo-European ‘wine’, *MSS* 48, 21–26.
- Blümel, W. (1972) *Untersuchungen zu Lautsystem und Morphologie des vorklassischen Lateins*, München: Kitzinger.
- von Brandenstein, C.-G. (1943) *Hethitische Götter nach Bildbeschreibungen in Keilschrifttexten* [MVAeG 46], Leipzig: Hinrichs.
- Broganyi, B. and Lipp, R. (2016). *Wein im Anatolischen, Griechischen, Italischen und Indogermanischen*, in: A. Ancilotti, A. Calderini and R. Massarelli (eds.), *Forme e strutture della religione nell’Italia mediana antica – Forms and Structures of Religion in Ancient Central Italy. III Convegno internazionale dell’Istituto di Ricerche e Documentazione sugli Antichi Umbri, 21–25 settembre 2011*, Roma: «L’Erma» di Bretschneider, 65–77.
- Brown, J.P. (1969) The Mediterranean vocabulary of the vine, *Vetus Testamentum* 19, 146–170.
- Buck, C.D. (1928) *A Grammar of Oscan and Umbrian, with a Collection of Inscriptions and a Glossary*, reprinted with additions and corrections, Boston: Athenaeum Press (reprinted 1979, Hildesheim: Olms).
- CAD 7 = I.J. Gelb, B. Landsberger and A.L. Oppenheim (eds.) (1960) *The Assyrian Dictionary of the Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago*, Volume 7: I and J, Chicago: Oriental Institute – Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin.
- Casaretto, A. (2004) *Nominale Wortbildung der gotischen Sprache. Die Derivation der Substantive*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Cohen, D. (ed.) 1996. *Dictionnaire des racines sémitiques ou attestées dans les langues sémitiques*. II. fasc. 6: W – WHLP. Leuven: Peeters.
- Demiraj, B. (1997) *Albanische Etymologien (Untersuchungen zum albanischen Erbwortschatz)*, Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- DELL = Ernout, A. and Meillet, A. (1967) *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue latine. Histoire des mots*, Paris: Klincksieck (Quatrième édition, deuxième tirage augmenté de corrections nouvelles).
- DMic. = Aura Jorro, F. (1985–1993) *Diccionario griego-español*, anejo II: *Diccionario micénico (DMic.)*, volumen I – volumen II, bajo la dirección de F.R. Adrados, Madrid: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas.

- Eichner, H. (1973) Die Etymologie von heth. *mehur*, *MSS* 31, 53–107.
- ET = Rix, H. (ed.) (1991) *Etruskische Texte. Editio minor*, Band I: *Einleitung, Konkordanz, Indices*, Band II: *Texte*, Tübingen: Narr [revised edition: Meiser, G. (ed.) (2014) *Etruskische Texte. Editio minor*, Teil 1: *Einleitung, Konkordanz, Indices*, Teil 2: *Texte*, Hamburg: Baar].
- EWAia II = Mayrhofer, M. (1996) *Etymologisches Wörterbuch des Altindoarischen*, II. Band, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Flobert, P. (1994) Les débuts de la vigne et du vin en Italie et en Gaule d'après le vocabulaire, *Bulletin de la Société Nationale des Antiquaires de France* 1992.1, 289–301.
- Friedrich, J. (1974) *Hethitisches Elementarbuch*, 1. Teil: *Kurzgefaßte Grammatik*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Gamkrelidze, T.V. and Ivanov, V.V. (1995) *Indo-European and the Indo-Europeans: A Reconstruction and Historical Analysis of a Proto-Language and a Proto-Culture*, Part I: *The Text* (English version by J. Nichols, edited by W. Winter), Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Gérard, R. (2009) Sur l'origine du nom hittito-louvite **wiyana*- « vin », in: C. Cannuyer, A. Degréve and R. Gérard (eds.), *Vin, bière et ivresse dans les civilisations orientales. Entre plaisir et interdit. René Lebrun in honorem* [Acta Orientalia Belgica 22], Louvain-la-Neuve: Société Belge d'Études Orientales, 15–21.
- Gippert, J. (1994) Die Glottaltheorie und die Frage urindogermanisch-kaukasischer Sprachkontakte, in: J.E. Rasmussen (ed.), *In honorem Holger Pedersen. Kolloquium der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft vom 25. bis 28. März 1993 in Kopenhagen*, Wiesbaden: Reichert, 107–123.
- Gorton, L. (2014) *Through the Grapevine: Tracing the Origins of Wine*, Ph.D. dissertation, Ohio State University.
- Gorton, L. (2017) Revisiting Indo-European “wine”, *Journal of Indo-European Studies* 45, 1–26.
- Greppin, J.A.C. (2008) Did the good wines come from Armenia?, *Aramazd: Armenian Journal of Near Eastern Studies* 3, 47–52.
- Harðarson, J.A. (1987) Das uridg. Wort für „Frau“, *MSS* 48, 115–137.
- Hawkins, J.D. (1995) *The Hieroglyphic Inscription of the Sacred Pool Complex at Hattusa (SÜDBURG)*, with an archaeological introduction by Peter Neve, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Hawkins, J.D. (2000) *Corpus of Hieroglyphic Luwian Inscriptions*, Volume I: *Inscriptions of the Iron Age*, Part 1: *Text. Introduction, Karatepe, Karkamiš, Tell Ahmar, Maraş, Malatya, Commagene* [UI SK 8.1], Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.
- Hoffner, H.A., Jr. and Melchert, H.C. (2008) *A Grammar of the Hittite Language*, Part 1: *Reference grammar*, Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.
- Humbach, H. (1959) *Die Gathas des Zarathustra*, Band II: *Kommentar*, Heidelberg: Winter.

- Humbach, H. (1991) *The Gāthās of Zarathushtra and the other Old Avestan texts*, in collaboration with J. Elfenbein and P.O. Skjærvø, Part II: *Commentary*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Kellens, J. (1984) *Le verbe avestique*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kellens, J. and Pirart, E. (1988) *Les textes vieil-avestiques*, Volume I: *Introduction, texte et traduction*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kellens, J. and Pirart, E. (1990) *Les textes vieil-avestiques*, Volume II: *Répertoires grammaticaux et lexique*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kellens, J. and Pirart, E. (1991) *Les textes vieil-avestiques*, Volume III: *Commentaire*, Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Kimball, S.E. (1994a) Loss and retention of voiced velars in Luvian: another look, *IF* 99, 75–85.
- Kimball, S.E. (1994b) The IE short diphthongs *oi, *ai, *ou and *au in Hittite, *Die Sprache* 36, 1–28.
- Kimball, S.E. (1999) *Hittite Historical Phonology* [IBS 95], Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Kloekhorst, A. (2008) *Etymological Dictionary of the Hittite Inherited Lexicon* [LIEEDS 5], Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Koehler, L. and Baumgartner, W. (1974) *Hebräisches und aramäisches Lexikon zum Alten Testament*, Lieferung II, Leiden: Brill (Dritte Auflage neu bearbeitet von W. Baumgartner).
- Kölligan, D. (2013) Greek and Latin elements in Oscan personal names, *Linguarum Varietas* 2, 119–124.
- Laroche, E. (1961) Études de toponymie anatolienne, *RHA* 19, 57–98.
- LDIA = Giacomelli, G. (1978) Il falisco, in: *Popoli e civiltà dell'Italia antica*. Volume sesto a cura di Aldo L. Prosdocimi: *Lingue e dialetti*, Roma: Biblioteca di storia patria, 505–542.
- Lejeune, M. (1987) Le vase de Latumaros (Discussions sur l'alphabet de Lugano), *Latomus* 46, 493–509.
- Leslau, W. (2006) *Comparative Dictionary of Ge'ez (Classical Ethiopic): Ge'ez-English – English-Ge'ez, with an Index of the Semitic Roots*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- LEW II = Walde, A. and Hofmann, J.B. (1972) *Lateinisches Etymologisches Wörterbuch*, Zweiter Band, Heidelberg: Winter (Fünfte Auflage).
- LF [with number of inscription] = Giacomelli, G. (1963) *La lingua falisca*, Firenze: Olschki.
- Lipiński, E. (1997) *Semitic Languages: Outline of a Comparative Grammar* [Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta 80], Leuven: Peeters.
- Lipp, R. (2009a) *Die indogermanischen und einzelsprachlichen Palatale im Indoiranischen*, Band I: *Neurekonstruktion, Nuristan-Sprachen, Genese der indoarischen Retroflexe, Indoarisch von Mitanni*, Heidelberg: Winter.

- Lipp, R. (2009b) *Die indogermanischen und einzelsprachlichen Palatale im Indoiranischen*, Band II: *Thorn-Problem, indoiranische Laryngalvokalisation*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Lipp, R. (forthcoming) The Proto-Indo-European *-r/n- stem suppletion and the locative of heteroclitic neuters, in: R.I. Kim (ed.), *Diachronic Perspectives on Suppletion*, Hamburg: Baar.
- Martirosyan, H.K. (2010) *Etymological Dictionary of the Armenian Inherited Lexicon* [LIEEDS 8], Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Matzinger, J. (2005) *Untersuchungen zum altarmenischen Nomen. Die Flexion des Substantivs*, Dettelbach: Röhl.
- McGovern, P.E. (2003) *Ancient Wine: The Search for the Origins of Viniculture*, Princeton, Oxford: Princeton University Press.
- McGovern, P.E., Fleming, S.J. and Katz, S.H. (eds.) (1996) *The Origins and Ancient History of Wine*, London, New York: Routledge (digital printing 2006).
- McGovern, P.E., Glusker, D.L., Exner, L.J. and Voigt, M.M. (1996) Neolithic resinated wine, *Nature* 381, 480–481.
- Meiser, G. (1986) *Lautgeschichte der umbrischen Sprache* [IBS 51], Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- Melchert, H.C. (1983) A 'new' PIE *men suffix, *Die Sprache* 29, 1–26.
- Melchert, H.C. (1993) *Cuneiform Luvian Lexicon* [Lexica Anatolica 2], Chapel Hill: self-published.
- Melchert, H.C. (1994) *Anatolian Historical Phonology* [LSIE 3], Amsterdam, Atlanta: Rodopi.
- Melchert, H.C. and Oettinger, N. (2009) Ablativ und Instrumental im Hethitischen und Indogermanischen: ein Beitrag zur relativen Chronologie, *InclInq* 32, 53–73.
- del Monte, G.F. and Tischler, J. (1978) *Die Orts- und Gewässernamen der hethitischen Texte* [TAVO Beihefte B 7; RGTC 6/1], Wiesbaden: Reichert.
- Moscatti, S. (ed.) (1964) *An Introduction to the Comparative Grammar of the Semitic Languages: Phonology and Morphology*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Neri, S. (2003) *I sostantivi in -u del gotico. Morfologia e preistoria* [IBS 108], Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck.
- Neri, S. (2013) Zum urindogermanischen Wort für 'Hand', in: A.I. Cooper, J. Rau and M. Weiss (eds.), *Multi Nominis Grammaticus. Studies in Classical and Indo-European Linguistics in Honor of Alan J. Nussbaum on the Occasion of his Sixty-Fifth Birthday*, Ann Arbor, New York: Beech Stave, 185–205.
- Neri, S. (2017) Wetter: *Etymologie und Lautgesetz*, Università degli Studi di Perugia: Centro Stampa Morlacchi.
- Neumann, G. (1962) Beiträge zum Lykischen II, *Die Sprache* 8, 203–212.
- Nussbaum, A.J. (1986) *Head and Horn in Indo-European* [UISK 2], Berlin, New York: de Gruyter.

- Oettinger, N. (2003) Zum Ablaut von *n*-Stämmen im Anatolischen und der Brechung $\bar{e} > ya$, in: E. Tichy, D.S. Wodtke and B. Irslinger (eds.), *Indogermanisches Nomen: Derivation, Flexion und Ablaut. Akten der Arbeitstagung der Indogermanischen Gesellschaft, Freiburg, 19. bis 22. September 2001*, Bremen: Hempen, 141–152.
- del Olmo Lete, G. and Sanmartín, J. (2003) *A Dictionary of the Ugaritic Language in the Alphabetic Tradition*, translated by W.G.E. Watson. 2 vols. [HdO I/67], Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Olsen, B.A. (1999) *The Noun in Biblical Armenian: Origin and Word-Formation. With Special Emphasis on the Indo-European Heritage*, Berlin, New York: Mouton de Gruyter.
- Otten, H. and Souček, V. (1969) *Ein althethitisches Ritual für das Königspaar*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Perpillou, J.-L. (2012) La plante à vin, in: A. Blanc, L. Dubois and C. de Lamberterie (eds.), *Πολύμητις. Mélanges en l'honneur de Françoise Bader*, Leuven, Paris: Peeters, 109–114.
- Poetto, M. (1993) *L'iscrizione luvio-geroglifica di Yalburt. Nuove acquisizioni relative alla geografia dell'Anatolia sud-occidentale*, Pavia: Iuculano.
- Poetto, M. (1995) Luvio *mi(ya)sa-* nell'ambito dell'interpretazione di *KUB 35.45 11 22–24*, *HS* 108, 30–38.
- Prosdocimi, A. (1984) *Le tavole iguvine*. I + Album delle tavole, Firenze: Olschki.
- Puhvel, J. (2012) Elliptic genitives and hypostatic nouns in Hittite, in: J. Puhvel, *Ultima Indoeuropaea* [IBS 143], Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachen und Literaturen der Universität Innsbruck, 122–126.
- Rabin, C. (1963) Hittite words in Hebrew, *Orientalia* N.S. 32, 113–139.
- Rieken, E. (1999) *Untersuchungen zur nominalen Stammbildung des Hethitischen* [StBoT 44], Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Rix, H. (1995) Il latino e l'etrusco, in: *Atti del convegno internazionale "Nomen latinum" – Latini e Romani prima di Annibale, Roma 24–26 ottobre 1995* [Eutopia 4.2], Roma: Quasar, 73–88.
- Rix, H. (1998) Teonimi etruschi e teonimi italici, *Annali della Fondazione per il museo "Claudio Faina"* 5, 207–229.
- Rix, H. (2008) Etruscan, in: R.D. Woodard (ed.), *The Ancient Languages of Europe*, Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 141–164.
- Rüster, C. and Neu, E. (1989) *Hethitisches Zeichenlexikon. Inventar und Interpretation der Keilschriftzeichen aus den Boğazköy-Texten*, Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Schindler, J. (1972) *Das Wurzelnomen im Arischen und Griechischen*, Ph.D. dissertation, Universität Würzburg.
- Schindler, J. (1977) Notizen zum Sieversschen Gesetz, *Die Sprache* 23, 56–65.
- Schmitt, R. (1981) *Grammatik des Klassisch-Armenischen mit sprachvergleichenden Erläuterungen* [IBS 32], Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck. (2., durchgesehene Auflage, 2007.)

- Schulze, W. (1966) *Zur Geschichte lateinischer Eigennamen*, Berlin, Zürich, Dublin: Weidmann (2. unveränderte Auflage).
- van Selms, A. (1974) The etymology of *yayin*, “wine”, *JNSL* 3, 76–84.
- Sihler, A.L. (1995) *New Comparative Grammar of Greek and Latin*, New York, Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Silvestri, D. (1974) ^{URU}*Uḫianayanda*: un problema di toponomastica anatolica, *SSL* 14, 266–274.
- de Simone, C. (2011) Il nome del “vino” nei dialetti dell’Italia antica, in: *La vigna di Dioniso: Vite, vino e culti in Magna Grecia. Atti del quarantanovesimo convegno di studi sulla Magna Grecia, Taranto, 24–28 settembre 2009*, Taranto: Istituto per la Storia e l’Archeologia della Magna Grecia, 473–479 [interventi: 545].
- Sivan, D. (2001) *A Grammar of the Ugaritic Language* [HdO I/28], Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature – Leiden: Brill (second impression with corrections).
- Solinas, P. (1995 [1994]) Il celtico in Italia, *Studi Etruschi* 60, 311–408.
- ST = Rix, H. (ed.) (2002) *Sabellische Texte: Die Texte des Oskischen, Umbrischen und Südpikenischen*, Heidelberg: Winter.
- Starke, F. (1990) *Untersuchung zur Stammbildung des keilschrift-luwischen Nomens* [StBoT 31], Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- Szemerényi, O. (1989) *An den Quellen des lateinischen Wortschatzes* [IBS 56], Innsbruck: Institut für Sprachwissenschaft der Universität Innsbruck.
- TI = Tabulae Iguvinae; current editions: Prosdocimi 1984 and ST Um1.
- Tibiletti Bruno, M.G. (1981) Le iscrizioni celtiche d’Italia, in: E. Campanile (ed.), *I celti d’Italia*, Pisa: Giardini, 157–207.
- Uhlich, J. (2007) More on the linguistic classification of Lepontic, in: P.-Y. Lambert and G.-J. Pinault (eds.), *Gaulois et celtique continental*, Genève: Librairie Droz, 373–411.
- de Vaan, M. (2008) *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and the Other Italic Languages* [LIEEDS 7], Leiden, Boston: Brill.
- Yakubovich, I. (2015) The Luwian Language. In: *Oxford Handbooks Online*, <http://www.oxfordhandbooks.com/view/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199935345.001.0001/oxfordhb-9780199935345-e-18> (accessed 21.10.2015).
- Zamora, J.-Á. (2000) *La vid y el vino en Ugarit*, Madrid: Consejo superior de investigaciones científicas.
- Zemánek, P. (1995) *Ugaritischer Wortformenindex* [Lexicographia Orientalis 4], Hamburg: Buske.
- Zgusta, L. (1984) *Kleinasiatische Ortsnamen*. Heidelberg: Winter.
- Zucha, I. (1988) *The Nominal Stem Types in Hittite*, Ph.D. dissertation, Oxford University.